UNITED STATES



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

FULL COMMITTEE

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM H. WEBSTER
TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Wednesday, April 8, 1987



OCA 87-2437 cy#____ E



WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

Α

PAGE

24

28

31

4/8/87.

1	<u>CONTENTS</u>
2	STATEMENT OF:
3	The Honorable John C. Danforth,
- 4	A United States Senator from the State of Missouri
5	The Honorable Christopher S. Bond, A United States Senator from
6	the State of Missouri
. 7	The Honorable William H. Webster,
8	Nominee to be Director of Central Intelligence
9	
10	
11	
_	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

SSCI FORM 23

23

24

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM H. WEBSTER TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Wednesday, April 8, 1987

United States Senate, Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, D. C.

The Select Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:13 o'clock a.m., in Room SD-628, Dirksen Senate Office Building, the Honorable David Boren, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Boren, Nunn, Hollings, Bradley, Cranston, DeConcini, Metzenbaum, Cohen, Roth, Hatch, Murkowski, Specter, Hecht and Warner.

Also Present: Sven E. Holmes, Staff Director/General Counsel; James Dykstra, Minority Staff Director; and Kathleen McGhee, Chief Clerk.

19

1

2

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

18_.

PROCEEDINGS

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee will come to order.

We are here today to consider the nomination of William H. Webster to be the Director of Central Intelligence. This hearing itself is a unique occasion. I know of no other nation where the selection of the top intelligence official would receive so much scrutiny. This process reflects our determination that while a democracy must legitimately protect the secrecy of some information and operations, the intelligence gathering process must still be ultimately accountable to the people through their elected representatives.

Through this confirmation process, our responsibilities as the members of the Select Committee is to determine whether this nominee is qualified to serve as the Director of Central Intelligence.

Accordingly, it is our responsibility to undertake a careful, thorough and fair examination of the background of this nominee. We do this in troubled times; in the midst of the present investigations by two special Congressional Committees and by an independent counsel of a covert action program involving allegations of illegal or improper activities by high government officials, including the CIA.

This Committee and the Senate have a duty to the American people to ensure that the new Director of Central Intelligence will conduct a program of effective intelligence gathering within the framework of our laws and our democratic institutions. It is imperative that the Director of Central Intelligence be a person of exceptional ability and integrity, capable of exercising the independence necessary to protect against any possible misuse of the Agency and its resources.

Judge Webster, I welcome you and feel certain that you recognize the magnitude of the new challenge that you have accepted. I would add to that challenge by asking that in responding to our questions today, you keep in mind the pressing need for this nation to bring order to the disarray in our foreign policy, and the need for all of us to go forward together in a bipartisan way to constructively address the urgent and important problems which we face.

As DCI, you would have three roles to perform: senior intelligence advisor to the President of the United States; coordinator of the entire intelligence community; and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I am sure that part of your deliberation concerning your decision to accept this nomination centered upon the tremendous burdens that you know from

 your experience in counterintelligence, rests on the shoulders of the Director of Central Intelligence.

You have served as the Chairman of the Interagency Group on Counterintelligence, a committee of the National Security Council. The first National Counterintelligence Strategy was developed under your leardership, improving the coordination between the FBI, the CIA, and other related agencies.

If confirmed as DCI, you will chair the Senior Interagency Group on Intelligence of the National Security Council, which greatly increases your responsibilities to further develop the overall National Intelligence Strategy. We must continue to concentrate on long-term strategic planning to meet the ever expanding need for timely and accurate information.

The competing demands upon the budget and the limited resources we have available make this job even more difficult. Great advances have been made in our intelligence capabilities, but we must continue to invest in this most important endeavor.

Our entire intelligence effort depends upon dedicated and professional career personnel, and this requires concentrated attention to improve career incentives and training in order to recruit the best possible available talent, and also to retain present

valued employees. And this Committee has again and again put emphasis on the personnel system and the need to continue to upgrade it and improve it.

There appears to be some progress in the ongoing arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. That makes it imperative for us to analyze the present methods of verification and to correct any shortcomings in order to guarantee our national security. And if you are confirmed to this post as Director of Central Intelligence, of course those of us who serve on this Committee jointly have a heavy responsibility in the area of assuring the ability to verify any arms control agreement.

This Committee is interested in your activities with respect to the Iran-contra matter, and we appreciate your responding to some written questions that the Vice Chairman and I sent to you to supplement the standard Committee questionnaire for nominees. We harve also received letters regarding your nomination from Representative Don Edwards, Chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee that oversees the FBI, and from Representative Pat Schroeder. Both are concerned about recent allegations of improper FBI activity. In addition, we have received statements from the Center for Constitutional Rights, the National Committee

Against Repressive Legislation, and from the Arab

American Institute. Without objection, these statements
and letters will be placed in the record at this
point.

(The documents referred to follow:)

THE CHAIRMAN: Also, I would like to enter at this point into the record for consideration by the Committee, the background and financial disclosure statement filed by Judge Webster with the Committee, pursuant to Committee Rule 5.6. And I would also mention that the Committee has taken action to authorize the Chairman to release unclassified excerpts of the testimony of Attorney General Meese before the Select Committee on Intelligence during the preliminary inquiry into the sale of arms to Iran and possible diversion of funds to the Nicaraguan resistance. And without objection, this testimony by Attorney General Meese before the Committee will be entered into the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

10[°]

important post.

 THE CHAIRMAN: At this time I will turn to the other members of the Committee for opening statements and comments which they might have, beginning with the Vice Chairman, Senator Cohen.

Judge Webster, I want to welcome you to the

SENATOR COHEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Committee this morning along with the two Show-Me
Senators from Missouri. Of course, we have had a chance
to work with you in the past several years in your
capacity as FBI Director, and in that position you have
had primary responsibility for U.S. counterintelligence
activities within this country. And personally, I
believe that your willingness to serve as Director of
Central Intelligence after those nine years as Director
of the Federal Bureau of Investigation really does set

As I understand it, this represents your fifth confirmation proceeding. I think by this time you know what to do and we'll see if we can't make it interesting.

an exemplary standard for public service. I think the

of your integrity and demonstrated ability to this

President ought to be congratulated for nominating a man

This comes at a time when the CIA and the intelligence community as a whole are in a degree of

turmoil, when their involvement in the Iran arms sale and the assistance to the Nicaraguan contras is the subject of investigations and of media inquiry, when we have shrinking budgets that are forcing difficult programmatic decisions, and when it appears that there are serious deficiencies in the security measures needed to protect intelligence operations.

So in short, today, perhaps more than at any other time in this Administration, the job calls for strong leadership, for someone who can represent the intelligence community's interests effectively and credibly, and who can restore the public's confidence in the intelligence community and its activities. I believe your appointment as Director of Central Intelligence would provide that strength and assurance.

As you know, and as the Chairman has indicated, you wear at least two hats, possibly three, one as coordinator of the U.S. intelligence activities, and the other as head of the Central Intelligence Agency. In both capacities, the focus of the DCI's activities is external to the United States in collecting and analyzing information necessary to support our defense and foreign policy objectives and in undertaking other types of operations, specifically covert operations.

These are areas that have not, for the most part,

been an integral part of your prior professional training and experience, either as an attorney, a Federal judge, or more recently, as FBI Director.

Accordingly, neither this Committee nor the American people have a very clear perception of your views on a number of fundamental questions, views which we ought to know prior to voting on your confirmation as DCI. These questions would include issues such as covert action, the strengths and weaknesses of our intelligence community, how you view the responsibilities of the DCI toward the President and especially toward this Congress.

I am hopeful that we can use the public hearing to explore some of these topics with you and establish a firmer understanding of your views in these areas for which you will be responsible if confirmed.

According to today's Washington Post, you intend to indicate that the Attorney General treated you like a "shunned lover" on the issue of the FBI's interest in investigating the Iran arms sale; that you offered your services, but the phone call never came. I can assure you that if you are confirmed as the Director, this Committee will call upon your services. We'll be sure to call you at least once a day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator DeConcini.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Mr. Chairman, I, too, welcome
Judge Webster, and concur with our colleagues as to the
outstanding service you have given to this country,
Judge Webster, even before you were nominated by
President Carter to be the Director of the FBI, as a
Federal jurist. I think as FBI Director you have
brought a tremendous amount of credibility to that
agency, even though there are still and probably always
will be certain criticisms of some of its actions, which
are necessary to be carried out in at least your
judgment and your subordinates. I welcome your
nomination, Judge Webster.

I feel that the CIA itself, though its budget has increased immensely under former Director Casey, has never, at least in the ten years I have been here, has the CIA been in such shambles. Nor has it had such image problems nationally and internationally of being an agency which is not tuned in, not under control, and doesn't know what it is doing. I don't think that is the case, but I believe that at least from my constituents and my travel, it is certainly the perception. You will face the problem of how do you bring credibility that you were able to bring to the FBI.

I want to assure you that I believe, in my short

tenure on this Committee, but even before, looking at the quality of people who serve as Chairman and Vice Chairman and the other members on this Committee, that you have people here who are prepared to assist you and not be destructive in maintaining and building the intelligence community capacity to serve this nation. I hope that you will feel comfortable after you're confirmed, to confide and to consult with this Committee, as often as you can.

I am a firm believer that foreign policy, including covert activities, is based on a consensus, on a bipartisan basis, and when President Reagan or Carter or anyone else has run into problems, it is because he has decided not to buildg a consensus. It is the Director of the CIA who makes the difference, in my judgment, in building that consensus. That is one of the reasons I am so pleased and proud that the President has appointed you, because I think you have proven you have that capacity. I wish you every success.

I have some questions, Mr. Director, that I will ask later, of course. I want you to understand these are questions that are not of a critical nature, but I feel should be laid out in the record. Perhaps someone else with more seniority may already have touched on those questions, and if so, I will remain silent.

~

3

4

5

7

9

10 11

12

13

1415

16

17

18_.

20

21 22

23

2425

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator DeConcini. Senator Roth.

SENATOR ROTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, want to welcome you, Judge Webster. I was very pleased when the President sent your name up for this very, very important position.

Judge Webster, I was on the Floor this morning introducing a package of espionage legislation for the 100th Congress. It is a broad series of measures that I believe will address some of our most serious problems in what could be called the Decade of the Spy. Now, my reason for bringing this up at this time is that I do intend to ask for your views, both as the Director of the FBI and as the nominee to be the new Director of Central Intelligence. Senator Dole joined me in this legislation, which will include a number of separate proposals, and I will advise you what they are so that we can proceed when it becomes my turn to raise questions. The question of restrictions on Soviet bloc personnel, or the satellite nations, whether we should have some restrictions on them in this country. question of whether there should be the death penalty for very, very serious spy offenses. The United Nations is proposing a new office for research and collection of

domestic information in each member country as to the political situation, whether or not this offers an opportunity for spying. And finally, I will be asking some questions on the current impasse over the new U.S. embassy in Moscow, whether or not we should permit the Soviet Union to occupy the proposed buildings in the city of Washington.

I think these are pertinent questions, and again, Judge Webster, I want to welcome you here today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator Roth. Senator Hatch.

SENATOR HATCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Webster, I have had a lot of contact with you as a member of the Judiciary Committee over the last ten years, and I just want to compliment you for your selection for this position. And I will be very interested in the hearings and will pay a great deal of attention. I have a conflict, because we have the Catastrophic Health Hearings upstairs in my other Committee, but I will be coming in and out. We just appreciate the service you have given to the country. We'll look forward to these hearings clearing the air and also look forward to your confirmation and your work as the Director of Central Intelligence.

I think you'll find that it will be just as

2 3

. 5

6

8

7

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

interesting if not more so than Director of the FBI, and I look forward to working with you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Hatch. Specter.

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Webster, I join my colleagues in welcoming you here this morning. There is no more important job in the Federal government, perhaps short of the presidency, than the one that you have been nominated for, and I think had there ever been any doubt about that, it would have been dispelled by the events of the past six months with respect to what has happened on the sale of arms to Iran and the diversion of funds to the contras.

Certainly the U.S. intelligence gathering operation is one of enormous importance in many respects. First, on foreign policy, if we are to have a successful foreign policy the CIA has to do its job on intelligence gathering. Beyond the function of gathering of intelligence itself, then there is the responsibility to advise the President on those Findings. And I think that requires independence and it requires restraint. And it may require -- perhaps does require -- telling the President what he doesn't want to hear on occasion,

and perhaps even repeating it when he doesn't want to hear it. And beyond advising the President, it is the responsibility to tell the Congressional Oversight Committees what the Congressional Oversight Committees have a right to know.

There may be some problem perhaps on the longstanding issue of serving two masters -- I don't think so -- because every official has an obligation to follow the law, and if there is a violation of law, especially ranking officials have an obligation to follow the law on an independent basis.

If our intelligence operations are to be successful, there is a real need for covert action, and at this time the covert action has fallen under disrepute because of the issues of an appropriate Finding, the issue of timely notice to this Committee. These questions will obviously be paramount in these proceedings, because we do not have to ask you hypothetical questions as to how you would discharge your duties as Director of the CIA because we have a case in point where we are trying to define standards for the appropriate role of timely notification and appropriate disclosure to the Congressional Oversight Committees.

As you know from our prior conversations, I have

certain questions that I want to ask you about Abscam.

And I do join in the welcome here and look forward to your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Specter. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I join others in welcoming this distinguished public servant and, on behalf of the citizens of this country, thank you for taking on this assignment rather than returning to the private sector and enriching yourself.

I, too, will join in the questions raised by my colleague from Pennsylvania concerning your relationship with the President. Not particularly this President, but the CIA Director has a very special relationship with any President — particularly your ability to look him straight in the eye and say Mr. President, this is bad advice you have gotten by someone else, and I caution you and suggest you change the course of action.

I am sure you have the strength and the conviction to do that. It is for that reason that you are going to have my whole-hearted support.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Warner. We are

privileged this morning to be joined by the former Vice Chairman of this Committee, the Senator from New York, Senator Moynihan, who has indicated to me he would like to also make a brief opening statement and some remarks on this occasion.

We're very happy to have you with us this morning, Senator Moynihan, and I recognize you at this time.

SENATOR MOYNIHAN: You are very generous, Mr.

Chairman, and Judge Webster, I am a bit of a voice from the past here, but I have something that I would like to put on the record, because it is something that will be part of the situation you come into. It has to do with the question of the ways in which the Senate Intelligence Committee is informed about anticipated covert activities, significant ones.

In 1984, the beginning of 1984, the Agency made the decision to mine harbors in Nicaragua. This Committee was not informed. This caused a great deal of distress with Senator Goldwater and myself and other members.

We decided to see if we could not make a better arrangement -- have something come out of our misunderstanding, if that was what it was. And on June 6 of 1984, Mr. Casey, Senator goldwater and I signed an agreement that had been approved by the President and the National Security Advisor which came to be known as

the Casey Accords.

The Accords had a very simple proposition: how would we define the word "significant"? What does that word mean. Judges frequently have to do that with statutes. We said, as a working definition, if the President approves an activity, we will take that to be significant, because there are only so many things he can get to and some things that no one would do without his approval.

That simple three page agreement had ten points, and the tenth point said that within a year we will review this agreement and see how it is working. And indeed an addendum was reached and signed. Only it was not done within the year. As things will do, it stretched on. And so the second agreement was not signed until June 17, 1986. We have first an '84 agreement, then two years later an '86 agreement.

The '86 agreement states that, "The Committee and the DCI agree that the Procedures," capital P, "have worked well and that they have aided the Committee and the DCI in the fulfillment of their respective responsibilities."

They added a few specific details to be considered as also automatically requiring notification, one of which said that even though a President doesn't

3

4

6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

necessarily approve, when "significant military equipment actually is to be supplied for the first time in an ongoing operation."

Now, Judge Webster, this agreement, this signed understanding of June 17, took place five months after the Presidential Finding to ship arms to Iran. And I have no more comment than to say that we have to see it as profoundly deceptive, and in the circumstances near to heartbreaking. I mean, the effort to produce an understanding on notification, made in such good faith by this Committee, was greeted in the other direction --I leave it to you to make your own judgments about it, but that the DCI could sign such a statement in June 1986, co-signed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee, was ruinous of a relationship which has to be reestablished. I am confident, sir, that you can do so. But I would want to bring to your attention what happened and it is really wrenching to know that it happened.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the full text of the Accords be included with my testimony at this point.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, very much, Senator

Moynihan. I think it is always useful to us to have that

perspective and to understand the context in which we

are now operating. Too often we are not aware enough of events that have taken place in the past and the procedures that have been put in place. I think it is very helpful to us to have that information before us, and I appreciate your entering it into the record this morning.

(The documents referred to follow:)

5.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have been joined by another member of the Committee this morning, and I believe he has opening comments to make. Senator Hecht, I am pleased to recognize you at this time.

SENATOR HECHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Nice to see you this morning, Judge. Nice to welcome a Missourian, since I was a native Missourian before moving to Nevada. I will have some questions for you after listening to your comments, pertaining to the local level in Nevada, your tenure -- your present position on the national level and international level.

Nice to have you here today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Hecht.

Judge Webster, this morning I notice that you have two very distinguished members of the Senate here to introduce you. Let me say you could not be accompanied by two finer individuals to officially present you to this Committee this morning. They are widely respected by members on both sides of the aisle. It is a privilege to have them here with you this morning, and to know that those from your home state think highly of you is a very high recommendation.

At this time I am privileged to recognize the senior Senator from Missouri, Senator Danforth. Senator

Danforth, we are glad to have you with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN C. DANFORTH,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

SENATOR DANFORTH: Mr. Chairman, thank you, very

much, members of the Committee. Sitting here listening

to the opening statements I am reminded of seeing Judge

Webster several weeks before the President designated

him as the next Director of the Central Intelligence

Agency and asking him what he would be doing after his

departure from the FBI in a year. I now find out what

he will be doing.

Mr. Chairman, it is often common for Senators from a nominee's state to appear before a Committee to give pro forma remarks about the reputation of the person who is being considered by the Committee. I want you to understand that in this case my remarks are not pro forma. In fact, Judge Webster's reputation over the last nine years since he has served as Director of the FBI has been well known by every member of Congress. He has brought great luster to his position at the FBI. He has restored that fine organization not only to its past heights, but to, I think, an unprecedented position in the minds of the members of Congress and indeed of the American people.

I think what I have to add to this Committee's consideration is the fact that I haven't just known

Judge Webster over the last nine years; I have known him over many, many years. When I was a young lawyer just beginning to practice law in my home town of St. Louis, I can remember at that time asking other lawyers the question who were really the fine attorneys of our city; who were the people with the best reputation. And always, Judge Webster's name would be on that list.

I knew him as a lawyer. I knew him as a United

States District Judge. I knew him as a member of the

8th Circuit Court of Appeals. Indeed, I believe I have a

unique claim for members of the Senate, in that I think

I am the only person in the Senate ever to have tried a

case in front of Judge Webster. I can say that I did

not agree with his opinion in that case —

(General laughter.)

SENATOR DANFORTH: I can also say that unfortunately the United States Supreme Court did agree with his opinion.

(General laughter.)

SENATOR DANFORTH: In addition to my own knowledge of Judge Webster, my family's knowledge of him even predates my own. He is a contemporary of my oldest brother. He serves on the Board of Trustees of Washington University where my brother is the Chancellor. My family has known him I guess all of his

18_.

life. And I am well aware of his reputation in his home community in the minds of people who have literally known him all his life.

Putting it very briefly, Mr. Chairman, Judge
Webster is the pride of St. Louis. He is a person about
whom it would be said by everyone who has known him, not
just for nine years, but for decades and decades, that
he is a person of enormous ability, of very great
character, of fine judgment. He is admired. He is
respected by all of those who have known him over the
period of his life. What you have seen for the past
nine years during his service as Director of the FBI is
exactly what he is and what he has been.

And I guess, Mr. Chairman, this sounds more like a rhapsody than testimony, and indeed it is; it is exactly that. But it is also a statement on the part of one Senator and one friend and one constituent, of appreciation that Judge Webster has given so much of himself and his enormous talent and ability to his country, not just for the past nine years, but for several decades now as a public servant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator

Danforth, for those fine comments, and Judge, the

Committee promises we will not hold against you your

incorrect ruling in that one case cited by Senator

Danforth.

(General laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are also privileged to have with us this morning the junior Senator from Missouri. I had the privilege of serving with him at the time that he was Governor of Missouri, and now the pleasure of serving with him in the Senate. Senator Bond, we are very happy to have you this morning, and we would welcome any comments from you at this time.

.

_

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

SENATOR BOND: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman
and members of the Committee.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to join with our distinguished senior Senator of Missouri in recommending to you wholeheartedly and without reservation William Webster for the position of Director of Central Intelligence. I, too, would associate myself with the comments that Senator Danforth has made about Judge Webster. I would go a step further to say that the entire state of Missouri takes great pride in the accomplishments, the record and the high standards which Judge Webster has exemplified.

I have had the privilege of knowing Judge Webster both personally and in a professional manner for about 20 years. It was that close association and very warm feeling for him that led me, in 1977, when I heard that he was being considered as Director of the FBI, to communicate to him a real note of caution. I urged him not to take the position of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Two things led to this unsolicited piece of advice. Number one, since as you may recall, Mr. Chairman I was returning involuntarily to the practice of law at that time, I had hoped to see

the Bench maintain the highest possible standards. And certainly Judge Webster exemplified those high standards for all who practiced law in the state of Missouri and elsewhere in the 8th Circuit.

On a more practical level, I was concerned about the condition of the FBI. Given its recent past history and the then current state of affairs, I felt that it was an impossible task for someone to go in and to restore the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the high standards it had once known. However, I should have known that Judge Webster was one who handles the difficult every day; the impossible takes only slightly longer.

His achievements as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are obviously very well known to all the members of this Committee and to most concerned citizens throughout this country. I am confident that should you confirm him, as I trust and hope that you will, that he will go on to provide the same high levels of service to the people of this country in his new position as he has done at the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It is my great pleasure and an honor once again to join with Senator Danforth recommending wholeheartedly his confirmation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator Bond. We appreciate both of you being with us this morning.

Judge Webster, at this time I would like to ask that you stand and be sworn to present the testimony before the Committee this morning. If you would raise your right hand.

Do you, William H. Webster, solemnly swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You may be seated.

Judge Webster, again I want to welcome you, and say
I have never heard finer and stronger introductory
comments by two Senators from the home state of a
nominee. They have been impressive indeed.

I want to ask if you have been provided with a copy of the Committee Rules and have had an opportunity to examine those Rules?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I believe I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: At this time we would welcome any opening remarks that you might have to make to the Committee.

 TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,

NOMINEE FOR DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

JUDGE WEBSTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman,

distinguished members of the Committee. I appreciate

very much your opening remarks, and I am deeply indebted

to my friends and fellow Missourians, Senator Danforth

and Senator Bond, for the generous comments that they

made this morning.

I have been looking forward to this moment and I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you today.

As Senator Cohen noted, this is now the fifth time that a Committee of the Senate has considered my fitness to serve in an office requiring Presidential appointment. I am deeply honored by President Reagan's nomination of me to be Director of Central Intelligence, and if the Senate chooses to confirm me, I will bring to the office the very best that I have in me.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that past confirmations must stand apart from the process that you begin today. I know that this Committee will wish to discuss with me my past stewardship in public office, and my thoughts and views about the office for which I am now being considered. Still, I do not exactly come before this Committee as a blank page. For nine years it has been

my privilege to appear before this Committee in its oversight capacity and report to you on the work of the FBI in counterintelligence and counterterrorism matters and to discuss with you my views on the broader picture of national security. I hope you know by now my unreserved support for your oversight function, and my deeply held view that this function can and should provide not only wisdom and guidance, but also reinforce public support and trust for the work of the intelligence community. Indeed, as recipients of sensitive intelligence information which cannot be made publicly available, you serve as surrogates for the American people.

The responsibilities of the Director of Central Intelligence are largely defined by statute and by Executive Order. The responsibilities are awesome and no Director of Central Intelligence can succeed without your full understanding and support. It is a shared responsibility, and we must succeed.

In my years of association with components of the intelligence community, I have developed some thoughts, some ideas and views, principally in counterintelligence, but also in the broader range and function of intelligence gathering and activities in furtherance of the national security. I would not,

however, want my answers to your questions today to suggest either that I think I know all the answers or that there is nothing more for me to learn. Quite the contrary. But I do have confidence in my own judgment, and even greater confidence in the enormous wisdom, talent and selfless dedication of the men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the other equally competent and dedicated components of the intelligence community. I believe I can sustain and enhance the collective momentum of the intelligence community to serve the national interest aggressively, objectively and professionally, and to do so with fidelity to our Constitution, our statutes, and all lawful orders issued pursuant thereto.

Mr. Chairman, rather than burden you with a lengthy and potentially presumptuous opening statement, I should like to conclude by reading two short paragraphs from a book written some years ago about a man, now in the twilight of his life, whom I am privileged to know as a friend. His name is Sir William Stephenson, and the book which made him more famous than I suspect he would like to be is titled "A Man Called Intrepid." Bill Stephenson wrote a forward to that book, and in that forward he said: "Perhaps a day will dawn when tyrants can no longer threaten the liberty of any people, when

the function of all nations, however varied their ideologies, will be to enhance life, not to control it. If such a condition is possible, it is in a future too far distant to foresee. Until that safer, better day, the democracies will avoid disaster, and possibly total destruction, only by maintaining their defenses.

"Among the increasingly intricate arsenals across the world, intelligence is an essential weapon, perhaps the most important. But it is, being secret, the most dangerous. Safeguards to prevent its abuse must be devised, revised, and rigidly applied. But, as in all enterprise, the character and wisdom of those to whom it is entrusted will be decisive. In the integrity of that guardianship lies the hope of free people to endure and prevail."

Mr. Chairman, I wish that I had written those words. I believe them, I subscribe to them, and if confirmed will do all that I can to be worthy of your trust.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my formal statement.

As you know, I have completed a number of questions to
the Senate and also some supplemental interrogatories.

I should like to make one addition at this time.

I am aware of a recommendation brought to my attention on or about October 30, 1986, to withhold

certain information from Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North of the National Security Council. This recommendation was made by a Department of Justice official who, based on newspaper articles, concluded that Lieutenant Colonel North might be involved in a future criminal probe by a special prosecutor concerning United States activities in Central America. The official was also of the opinion that this dissemination was not necessary because it was already available through the media.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this information was contemplated in the question previously answered for the record which specifically excludes public media sources. But further, the information proposed to be withheld from Lieutenant Colonel North did not mention Lieutenant Colonel North or any other government official. I did not then nor do I now believe that any of this information was information, quote, "regarding activities of U.S. officials that had the purpose or effect of providing illegal or unauthorized assistance to the Nicaraguan resistance during the period that such assistance was prohibited by law," close quote. That was the question.

Nevertheless, on reflection, I have concluded that this information should also be provided to you and I wish to supplement my previous interrogatory with this

statement. And I might add that all pertinent details regarding this matter have been furnished to the Independent Counsel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Judge Webster. The record will reflect that your answer has been so supplemented, and I appreciate your providing this additional information to the Committee. I also appreciate the comments which you have made in your opening statement. You have eloquently described the burden which we all have to strike that appropriate balance between the need for an effective intelligence operation, one in which confidentiality of sensitive information must be maintained, and at the same time an operation that must be conducted according to law, and under the appropriate oversight of those that have been elected by the people to perform that function. I think your statement is a well taken and an eloquent one.

I also appreciate the fact that you have commented upon the talent and the dedication of countless numbers of staff people, professionals who work at the Central Intelligence Agency and throughout the intelligence community, because I think all too often it is only the problems that get the attention. By the very nature of their work, the successes never become a matter of public record. Day in and day out, we have an

exceptional group of people, extraordinarily talented, courageous, committed and unselfish in many, many ways, who are performing an outstanding task. I think it is important that all of us reaffirm our appreciation to them because it is an appreciation that too often goes unstated.

As has been said in the opening comments, and I know from your own past experiences, you have exercised these kinds of responsibilities yourself, we all have the responsibility of making sure today that our inquiry into your qualifications is complete and thorough. We hope that it will be fair in every way. I know that you understand that in directing specific questions to you, no hostility is intended, but we are simply meeting our responsibility to do the job which we are given under the constitutional process.

We will go through a round of questions. I will begin that questioning, and we will just continue that process with the members of the Committee until all of the members have had an opportunity to ask all the questions that they wish to ask. Some members will be coming and going during the process because of other Committees that are in session this morning.

I notice in your response as you discuss the suspension of the FBI's preliminary Neutrality Act

investigation of Southern Air Transport on October 30th, 1986, you were informed that sensitive hostage negotiations were going on. Did you have any idea at the time that Southern Air Transport might be involved in both U.S. arms shipments to Iran and private arms deliveries to the contras in Nicaragua?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not associate the two. We had — we were opening an investigation that had to do with the crash of a transport plane in Nicaragua which had originated from El Salvador, but which had possibly some connections with Southern Air in Florida. That was a preliminary inquiry. I also had some knowledge relayed to me by a senior FBI official, Mr. Revell, who sits on the operations subgroup, the group at the National Security Council, that the same airlines had assisted in the Iranian initiatives. But that is the extent of the connection between the two.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you had known that there existed some connection that might potentially involve the diversion of funds or any other kind of connection --

JUDGE WEBSTER: Oh, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- would it have made a difference to you in your decision to suspend, whether or not to suspend the FBI investigation at that point?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I am sure that it would, but there was no such indication.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me turn your attention now to your conversations with Attorney General Meese on November 21st, 1986, when he informed you of his prospective inquiry. I want to go to the nature of the conversation which you had with Mr. Meese on November 21st. Did Mr. Meese explain to you in any kind of detail why he was conducting this inquiry?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, it was a very casual conversation; it was not an agenda item. I was just visiting with the Attorney General. And he indicated to me that he had been given the ticket or had been asked by the President to straighten out the various confusing statements that were coming out of various departments of government with respect to what actually had transpired in relation to Iran and that he was going to try to get the facts straight.

Did you want me to proceed, Mr. Chairman, or did you have another question?

SENATOR COHEN: Could you clarify the date on which that conversation took place?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That was Friday, November 21st, Senator.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long did that conversation take?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Oh, I suppose I was in the Attorney General's office for probably maybe 20 minutes, and probably that conversation itself took about a minute and a half, I guess.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it was a very brief conversation about this inquiry. And I understand that at that time you offered assistance. Looking back, do you think — and we always can look back with more in our minds in hindsight than we would have understood at the time — do you think that the Attorney General would have been better advised to have had someone from the FBI or the Justice Department with extensive criminal law experience take part in that inquiry?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I first should emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that neither of us saw this as a criminal inquiry. The purpose was to try to get the facts straight so that the government could be speaking with one accurate voice. And when I made that offer of assistance, I was thinking primarily in terms of manpower resources. Is there anything we can do in that way for you? He was also thinking in terms of an inquiry, a fact-finding inquiry to report back to the President. So neither of us were thinking in criminal terms.

You can always look back and ask in light of what

transpired, could the FBI agents have done a better job of conducting such an inquiry or looking for materials. I don't think we're in a position yet to know really the answers to that question. There is also the downside of sending FBI agents into the White House when there is no known criminal activity to investigate. So you can say, sure, maybe we knew better how to ask the questions or maybe we knew better how to do something else. But it was not a criminal inquiry. The Attorney General took his own group of experienced attorneys from the Department of Justice. And I am just not able to say that in hindsight we could have done a better job than they did. But that —

THE CHAIRMAN: Had you known that it was going to indeed turn into a criminal inquiry, which it did four days later, in essence, when you were asked to bring the Bureau into it, thinking specifically about the need to protect records and the need to protect potential evidence, had you known on the 21st that this was to become a criminal inquiry, would you at that time have advised the Attorney General that either the FBI or those within the Justice Department who have dealt with a criminal inquiry should have been brought into it specifically to protect evidence?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. If I

5.

might go one step further, I am confident the Attorney General wouldn't have had to have that; he would have asked for it had he known it would be a criminal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I gather then it does not surprise you that the Attorney General in his testimony before the Committee on December 17th, which we have released today, testified that you agreed, and I quote from this, you agreed that it would not be appropriate for the FBI to be brought in at that time.

JUDGE WEBSTER: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: This morning you have entered into the record some comments in regard to a memorandum, an internal FBI memorandum dated October 30th, which bears your initials, which indicates that an official at the Justice Department had speculated that Colonel North might someday come under a criminal investigation, and that certain information which was contained in this memorandum might best be withheld from him at that time. I wondered if, when you had those discussions with Attorney General Meese on November 21st, it must have been known that Colonel North was one of those involved with the Iranian matter, if you had in mind or gave any thought to this information passing across your desk, that there were at least some people in the Justice Department who had suspicion that Colonel North might

become the target of criminal investigation?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I have to tell you in all candor it was not on my mind. In fact, I don't even recall seeing it until it was called to my attention recently in connection with preparing the answers to these questions. It came up with the kinds of informational notes that come up literally by the dozens, call for no action on my part, had been reviewed by all of my career subordinates in the criminal line. I really did not have that in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: So there was nothing in your mind at that time that caused you to have any feeling that this might turn into a criminal investigation.

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, Mr. Chairman. It was entirely focused on Iran and the Iranian situation, the Iranian initiative. I frankly have entertained some ill ease about the role of the National Security Council in those areas, but I had no question about whether anything illegal was taking place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me go now directly to the point of oversight responsibility, and of course as you know, prior notification is to be given to this Committee, or at least in extraordinary circumstances to the leadership of this Committee in regard to covert actions, significant intelligence gathering activities,

U

or any illegal intelligence gathering activities that are brought to the attention of government officials. These are also to be reported.

Can you think of any circumstances in which the President should withhold prior notice all together, even of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee and the four leaders of the two Houses?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to conjure up situations in which I, based on my own experience with this Committee, would want to see information withheld. This is not to say that the President might take a different view of an extraordinarily sensitive, potentially life-threatening initiative that could be damaged and lives put at risk if there were some kind of premature exposure. I have difficulty thinking of any such situations. But the President has a more overriding responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN: If for some reason some dire emergency developed where notice were withheld from this Committee, the President, of course, then is required to provide notice after the fact in a timely fashion. How would you interpret that phrase, "in a timely fashion"?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, of course, I went to the dictionary, having a name of that kind -- Webster's Dictionary --

(General laughter.)

JUDGE WEBSTER: I didn't get very much help there nor really in the legislative history. It speaks about an appropriate time or in reference to something. In law, if there is a specific number of days you have to do something, then you would decide whether you did it in a timely way, that is, within the time prescribed. If there is no time, and it appears that this issue was wrestled out during the legislation, then we have to fall back on words like appropriate.

And in trying to articulate to you my view of this, which I knew that you would ask, it seems to me that notice is timely at the moment when the compelling circumstances which the President felt called for deferral ceased to be as compelling as the legitimate interests of the Congress and its Select Committee in knowing it. In other words, a deferral is not something you just put off indefinitely. A deferral goes against the tide and it should be continually revisited. It should be a subject of constant agenda review to determine whether it is appropriate at that point to let the Committee know.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you had been Director of Central Intelligence during the period of time in which we have just passed with the Iranian arms situation and

SSCI FORM 23

notification had been withheld for many months as it was, would you have advised the President that you felt it was inappropriate to withhold notification of this Committee for that period of time?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you were the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and a President took action to withhold notice for prolonged periods of time over your repeated objections and your strong feeling that it was wrong in terms of the spirit of the law and wrong in terms of public policy to continue to withhold notification, what course of action would you take?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Director of Central Intelligence clearly has an obligation directly with the Senate through this Committee, and that is an obligation of trust which would be breached by my continued acquiescence in something that I believed to be arbitrary, and for all the reasons that you have just stated, inappropriate. And I think that I would have to advise the President of my position on that, and if he would not authorize me to speak to you, I would have to leave. It is that simple.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask one last question related to this matter. As you know, the law talks about intelligence gathering activities, and intelligence

operations, and it says that this Committee is to be notified of intelligence gathering activities and operations conducted by any agency. We have always assumed in the past that it would be the traditional agencies like the Central Intelligence Agency. We have learned in this instance that other bodies, including the National Security Council, have undertaken operations at some point in time that are intelligence activities.

If you learned of what appeared to be legal activities by, let us say, the National Security

Council, agencies that are not considered traditionally intelligence operative agencies, or if you learned of illegal activities, either one, about which this

Committee had not been notified, would you view it as your responsibility — even though you are Director of Central Intelligence, you wouldn't be director of the National Security Council or any other agency that might be involved — would you view it as your responsibility as the overseer of intelligence in general, to report such legal or illegal intelligence activities to this Committee?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would consider it my first obligation to insist that the member of the intelligence Community or the National Security Council make the

12_.

notification itself, and if it refused to do so, I would consider it my obligation to inform you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Senator Cohen. SENATOR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Webster, you had some notice of the activities that were taking place with respect to the sale of arms to Iran, as I recall, in August of 1986.

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's correct.

SENATOR COHEN: The circumstances were such that a deputy of yours had a conversation with Colonel North, is that correct?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That is correct, Senator Cohen. It was not a private conversation. It was at the operations subgroup committee meeting at the Executive Office Building.

SENATOR COHEN: But you were concerned enough about it to contact Mr. Meese directly?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I was concerned enough about it to contact the Attorney General directly.

SENATOR COHEN: Were you concerned, for example, that it might be in violation of the Export Control Act?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I wasn't focusing so much on specific statutes so much as I wanted to be sure that the initiative was supported by a Presidential Finding as Lieutenant Colonel North had represented to Mr.

Revell, and that the Attorney General had himself reviewed it and approved it. We've had experiences in the past when the Department of Justice has somehow gotten outside the loop on decisions in which the Attorney General really should have been involved and really should have passed judgment. And that was what I wanted to ascertain for myself and to put the Attorney General on notice, if in fact he was unaware of it.

SENATOR COHEN: And the Attorney General assured you that a Presidential Finding had in fact been signed, or rather that a draft had been considered?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The Attorney General -- I asked the Attorney General was he aware of the Finding and had he seen it. He said he was aware of the Finding. He had seen it or a draft of it and that he had approved it.

SENATOR COHEN: Was that satisfactory in your judgment, to have a draft simply looked at by the Attorney General?

JUDGE WEBSTER: It was satisfactory in my judgment at the time that the Attorney General was aware of everything I was aware of, and that he had approved it as Attorney General.

SENATOR COHEN: Did you inquire as to whether or not Congress had been notified, or was required to be notified under that Finding?

SSCI FORM 23

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I didn't.

2 3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SENATOR COHEN: Were you aware at the time of allegations about Iran's participation in the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I probably was, Senator Cohen. am not certain of the dates, but I probably was. informed of everything that was known at that time with respect to the bombing.

SENATOR COHEN: Was that a matter of some concern to you outside the legality of whether or not the Attorney General was notified about a Presidential Finding as to the propriety and wisdom of engaging in a covert operation of arms transfers to a nation that was listed as a terrorist nation, who had in fact participated in the killing, murder of 241 Marines?

JUDGE WEBSTER: It certainly was of concern to me that if there was to be a departure from our public policy with respect to state-sponsored terrorism, that it be done pursuant to an appropriate Presidential Finding that the Attorney General thought was lawful and appropriate.

Prior to October 30th, were members SENATOR COHEN: of your staff concerned about Colonel North's alleged activities in Nicaragua, the funding of the contras?

JUDGE WEBSTER: It seems to me that there was quite

a flurry of publicity in the early weeks of October of 1986, in which various people including Members of Congress, speculated on the activities of the United States in Central America, and I believe, although I am not absolutely certain, that Colonel North's name appeared in some of those news articles.

SENATOR COHEN: Do you know whether or not members of your staff, Mr. Revell in particular, contacted Mr. North to inquire as to whether he was involved in the funding of the contras?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I don't know the answer to that.

SENATOR COHEN: Let me ask you, as of November --

JUDGE WEBSTER: Pardon me.

(Pause.)

SENATOR COHEN: That's a pose guaranteed to put you on the front pages.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I can't remember. I can't remember any such conversation being communicated to me. Perhaps in some other way. I do know that from time to time Lieutenant Colonel North or stated -- made statements in telephone calls to Mr. Revell and at meetings that whatever he was doing he was doing pursuant to authorization. But whether it related to Central America, I cannot now recall.

SENATOR COHEN: If the FBI had been asked to

SSCI FORM 23

conduct the preliminary inquiry as of November 21st as opposed to Attorney General Meese, what would you have done differently. Strike that. What would you have done?

JUDGE WEBSTER: First of all, I think I would want to know -- have a clear understanding of what it is we were being asked to do. If we were being asked to assist in a factual inquiry, such as the Attorney General performed, that would be one thing. If we were asked to conduct a criminal inquiry, that would be quite another thing.

SENATOR COHEN: What would you have done, assuming it was only a preliminary inquiry, to find out what had been done. A newspaper article had been written revealing the fact that we had been transferring weapons to Iran at that point. There was a lot of confusion. You said you were concerned about the NSC being involved in this operation from the beginning in terms of its operational activities on a covert operation. What would you have done as Director of the FBI in terms of the initial phase of that investigation? I am talking specifically about securing documents and preventing them from being destroyed. What would you have done with respect to putting your agents into the White House, contacting officials. What would be the process?

JUDGE WEBSTER: First, I want you to understand that in nine years I have never pretended to be the expert investigator.

SENATOR COHEN: What would your staff have done?

JUDGE WEBSTER: My staff, I am confident, would have made arrangements for interviews, would have made arrangements to review records, would have correlated the public statements that were out there that we're trying to relate to, either confirm or disprove in terms of factual circumstances. They would have developed a game plan before we went there, what it is we were trying to determine, what it is we would be looking for. And I suspect that probably the Attorney General did pretty much the same thing, but I don't know that.

SENATOR COHEN: You indicated on December 4th in an interview that you were satisfied that documents were not being destroyed, and that it would not in any way interfere with the investigation. At that time, what led you to conclude that documents were not being destroyed?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Is that interview around the 5th of December with a group of reporters?

SENATOR COHEN: The 4th.

JUDGE WEBSTER: 4th of December. The FBI was fully involved at that time investigating the alleged illegal

activities. My senior staff officials had reported to me that they had thus far found no evidence of records being missing from the files, that there was a substantial computer record of what was there --

SENATOR COHEN: There were reports in the paper that documents were being destroyed during the course of that weekend.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I realize that there were reports in the paper, but I am telling you what my senior staff officials advised me. And that at least as of that date -- and I was very careful in my interview on that date to say as of that date -- we had not determined any evidence of record destruction. And that is still the case. I know of no new information that should have made me alter my statement.

SENATOR COHEN: You have not learned of any information since that time that would cause you to reflect upon whether or not it was a mistake not to go in and at least secure the records?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I am having difficulty answering your question because this relates to the Independent Counsel's inquiry and that is protected by Rule 6 (E) as you know.

SENATOR COHEN: Fawn Hall has been in every newspaper and publication in the country, and already

•

admitted publicly that she destroyed documents.

JUDGE WEBSTER: But I am not in a position to confirm that or deny that, Senator, at this point, because of the constraints of the Independent Counsel's investigation. I think the information that I had, that is, the information that the state of our investigation was accurately stated at that time. Fawn Hall was not cooperating at that time, Senator, and did not cooperate until several weeks later.

SENATOR COHEN: Well, I have a number of other questions to pursue. My time is up. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Nunn.

SENATOR NUNN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Director Webster, I want to ask a few questions that are rather general in nature rather than specific. You mentioned a few minutes ago that you were ill at ease about the National Security Council that you -- I don't remember the exact words, but you said that you didn't sense any illegal activity, but you were ill at ease about certain things with the National Security Council. Would you expand on that and tell us what you were ill at ease about, how that came to your attention and so forth?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I think that a lot of what I

was ill at ease about is very accurately portrayed in the Tower Commission Report. There was a lot of frustration and impatience in the Executive Branch over the delay in getting the hostages out, and committees were formed which met in the National Security Council for the purpose of coming up with new and innovative ideas about how the hostages — their release could be obtained.

I guess it starts with the title of this committee, "Operations Subgroup." I kept asking Mr. Revell to be sure that this committee was not, in fact, operational, but was simply a think tank for purposes of coming up with new ideas. It has never seemed to me that the National Security Council was an appropriate vehicle for conducting operational activity. That is was a place where ideas were marshaled and policy was developed which could go to the President for his approval, and that people in the National Security Council, staffers with various types of expertise, largely lacked the capability and the institutional experience to engage in operational matters. And that that was better handled by those to whom operational matters are properly assigned. So I had ill ease when I felt that the National Security Council had become the focal point for operational initiatives. And I expressed that to Mr.

1

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Revell and asked him to be alert for any indications that the National Security Council itself was going operational.

SENATOR NUNN: Who did you stress that to?

JUDGE WEBSTER: To Mr. Oliver Revell, Buck Revell,
my Executive Assistant Director who served as a member
of the Operations Subgroup as my representative.

SENATOR NUNN: Did he express his own concern to you about that? What was his view on it?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I think he shared that concern and was always very alert at those meetings to caution members of the committee about the limitations of their role and responsibility, and was very careful to report to me any information that came through that committee that suggested operational activity.

SENATOR NUNN: Judge Webster, you have gotten involved to some extent, I suppose, in Presidential Findings. You are familiar with the Findings required by law and so forth for intelligence operations, are you not?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I am a lot more now than I was then. I was aware of the principle of Findings because the Attorneys General in the past have had opportunities to participate, and of course the present Attorney General sits by invitation as a member of the National

Security Council. There are some aspects of the Findings that I am frankly not familiar with, and until the Findings in the Iranian arms shipments, I don't believe that I had ever seen one. Nor was I even aware — although the statute certainly makes it clear — that there was an obligation to inform the Congress in a particular way about those Findings.

SENATOR NUNN: Have you had a chance since all this came up to review the statute requiring Findings?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I have indeed.

SENATOR NUNN: You are familiar with that now?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I hope so.

SENATOR NUNN: We had testimony from former General Counsel Sporkin who testified before this Committee that he believed that once the President signed a Finding, that previous activity which had not been part of a Finding and which could be considered, I suppose prior to that, unauthorized if not illegal, that that signing of a Finding made that previous activity legal retroactively. How do you view that?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I have not done extensive legal research on it, and I suppose that a legal argument can be made for an ex post facto Finding, but in my opinion an ex post facto Finding is contrary to the clear spirit of the statutory requirement. It is

not what was intended, and it simply records the President's opinions. And I doubt very much that it would be satisfactory to this Committee and it would not be satisfactory to me. It was damage control, nothing less.

SENATOR NUNN: How do you feel about the statute as far as a Finding being in writing or oral? Do you have an opinion on whether oral Findings are in compliance with the law?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, there again I think that probably a strong legal case can be made that an oral Finding may meet the requirements of the statute. I don't happen to think that it, again, meets the spirit of the statute. A Finding has a purpose. A Finding is to state in writing the basis for the action so that it can be reviewed and understood, and the specifics of it made available to all those who have responsibility, including the Oversight Committee. A Finding that is oral is always subject to modification at some other time.

We have in our work in the FBI a number of situations in which emergency authorizations can take place orally, by oral approval of the Attorney General, when I seek it because of a very tight timeframe. I am sure there could be situations in which there was such a

time bind that it was not possible at that moment in time to execute a written Finding. But that would not excuse an immediate effort to reduce that oral Finding to writing so that the full understanding of the President, his full conclusion and desires could be made available for oversight.

SENATOR NUNN: I think that is very helpful.

Judge Webster, you have headed up the FBI now how many years?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Nine years last February.

SENATOR NUNN: What do you think of the statute that gives a lengthy term to the head of the FBI? Do you think that has worked fairly well?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The statute is a ten year term. I have always construed it as a limitation, not as a guarantee. It has had the effect, and I think with the help of the Congress, in distancing the FBI from political activity by having a Director who serves without reference to a Presidential term. But I do serve at the pleasure of the President. Any President could ask me to leave and I would certainly do so. The ten year term also has an advantage of a certain expectation, that if you do your job well, you will have ten years in which to achieve substantial goals. And it tends to relieve — it certainly did in my case — any

sense of urgency that I had to achieve something within a year to two years, and permitted me to insist that our progress be along established, acceptable guidelines, and not by any shortcut means.

SENATOR NUNN: Would you be willing to stay beyond this Presidential term if requested to do so by the next President? Have you precluded that in your own mind? I am not asking you to give an unequivocal yes now, but do you have in your own mind a definite time limit on how long you're willing to serve in this capacity?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I don't, Senator Nunn. I have no present thoughts on it, and I must be entirely honest with you; I have no thoughts at all about it. I do -- the one thought that I have is that I would like to see, if it is at all possible, the Director of Central Intelligence be seen, be perceived in the position that I now think the Director of the FBI is seen, as not a political figure.

SENATOR NUNN: Well, that was my next question. Is there some value to making the CIA Director as removed from the political atmosphere as possible?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think so; absolutely.

SENATOR NUNN: You do see an analogy between the FBI head and the CIA head in that respect?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I do, and I think the American

SSCI FORM 23

people want the CIA to perform in that way.

SENATOR NUNN: Judge Webster, there has been, of course, speculation floating around this town for many, many years about the relationship between the FBI and the CIA. How would you describe that relationship now, and is there anything you think you can do to improve it in your new position, in which I think you will be confirmed and which I plan to support.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Nunn, we have a very -- we being the FBI -- have a very cordial relationship with the Central Intelligence Agency. We share information. We hand off assets to each other. We make some joint assessments. We coordinate our work with each other, having in mind there is a line of responsibility which is clearly the FBI's and a line on the other side of which is clearly the CIA. When I first came into office in 1978, the then Director of Central Intelligence was Admiral Stansfield Turner. We had been classmates in college and friends for over 40 years. And the first thing that we decided to do was to demonstrate by our own relationship to each other, that we wanted the two agencies to work together. it was not something that met massive resistance. It was something that I believe that the executives on both sides of the aisle had wanted to see happen but weren't all that sure would be

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

well received by their respective directors.

When Director Casey came on board we continued that same warm relationship. And I can say the same about Acting Director Gates. There may well be areas within the two organizations that could do a better job of liaison, and I think that both sides can work towards that. But it represents no mutual distrust, no sense of rivalry. Simply a matter of making the bureaucracies work better together.

SENATOR NUNN: Mr. Chairman, I think my time has expired. I would say I have had a lot of dealings with Judge Webster over the years, particularly in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. I have always found him to be not only skillful and energetic, but also a man of great integrity. I think his nomination at this critical juncture is hopefully going to be well received by the United States Senate and the American people. I think it is a good appointment, and of course, I will listen to the answers of all questions and reserve final judgment, but I do think he is the kind of individual and has the kind of sensitivity that we need in a very, very important and sensitive job.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator Nunn. Senator Roth.

SENATOR ROTH: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Webster, last year the Congress directed the President to make a report on the spy activities of the Soviet Bloc so that Congress could determine whether it is in our interest to apply further travel restrictions to Bloc personnel, basically equivalent to those we already have on the Soviets. We have that report, and I think it bears the mark of heavy FBI input. Based on that report and my continuing concern about Soviet use of East European agents to collect sensitive material or for their own purposes, I am introducing last year's bill to apply such restrictions. Could you give us your views on this legislation?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Roth, I have not seen the draft legislation sufficiently to comment on it specifically, but I know its purpose and intent, and certainly support it. The expulsions of numerous Soviet spies as a result of Presidential action a few months ago will undoubtedly increase the tasking responsibilities of Soviet Bloc hostile intelligence officers operating in this country. I see no reason why they should not be included within the same restrictions that apply to the Soviets.

SENATOR ROTH: To go along, I reintroduced today, along with Senator Dole, the death penalty legislation. It amends Title 18 of the U.S. Code, which would allow

such a penalty for certain offenses in time of war, or if the offense concerned nuclear weaponry, military spacecraft, early warning systems, warplanes or other major intelligence capabilities. As an experienced jurist, as well as the head of FBI, I wonder if you would give us your views on the usefulness of such legislation, recognizing of course that it is very controversial in nature.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Roth, I have given testimony from time to time and before other Committees on my views on the death penalty generally, and in that testimony, in various ways, I have always said that I thought there was a place for the death penalty in our system. And when pressed for examples of that, of course I used the example of the prisoner in prison serving a life term for whom there is no additional punishment to be given when he kills a guard. And then I think in most cases I have used another example. To me, the saddest word in the English language is betrayal, and the foulest word is traitor. If we cannot apply the ultimate punishment to one who is engaged in the kinds of activities that you have described, I do not think we have a sufficient national sensitivity to the enormous damage being done to us as citizens and as a country. So I would support it.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SENATOR ROTH: Well, I very strongly agree with you and appreciate your frank comment.

Very recently, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary General of the UN has authorized the creation of a new office -my understanding is, it is Soviet inspired -- in the UN Secretariat. And this new office, heavily staffed by Soviet intelligence personnel, we fear will effectively create a Soviet controlled UN intelligence collection and propaganda agency at the UN. Theoretically the idea is that it would secure information on the domestic situation in each of the member states. But Senators Boren and Cohen joined me in writing to the Secretary General, noting our concern and saying that it was our intention to remove any funding by the Congress. My proposed legislation would do that. I wonder, would the collection of internal domestic information on domestic politics and other internal situations give you concern from the standpoint of intelligence?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, if I understand the proposal, and I think that I do, it would give me the concern that it provides a unique opportunity for the KGB to engage in manipulative activity at our expense. I think we should be very careful about it.

SENATOR ROTH: My final question in this area,

Judge Webster, involves the President's comments

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

yesterday about the unacceptable Soviet penetration of our new embassy complex in Moscow, while they sit atop Mount Alto here in Washington intercepting our government communications. Again, Senator Dole and I introduced a bill requiring the Secretary of State to negotiate a new proposal on these embassies, and we would provide that if they don't negotiate such an agreement that is acceptable within six months, we would take a number of actions. Let me ask you this: Do you believe the new U.S. embassy in Moscow can ever be made secure without bulldozing it and starting afresh, based on your knowledge about such matters?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator, I want to be as open and candid as I can in an open session, but that is necessarily limiting to me. I think I can answer your question at least to your satisfaction. I think the focus has to include, at least, how and by whom our embassy is to be repaired or replaced. As long as we are dependent upon Soviet workers to do any of that work, it will not succeed.

SENATOR ROTH: Let me ask you one final question this round because my time is up. Considering the cost of securing our government communications in the Washington area from intercept by the Soviet Mount Alto site, do you think it would be desirable for us to

require the Soviets to move to some other site in the city? At least, say, comparable to our location in Moscow?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I suppose that that kind of an initiative would be wrapped up in our negotiations with respect to our embassy in the swamps in Moscow. I am not in a position to say in an open meeting, nor am I confident that I have the exact technical awareness, to say how much damage they are doing. But they are currently in a position in their present location to capture enormous amounts of microwave transmissions. And in this city, we seem to be tremendously careless about what we say on our telephones. And we have had a lot of experience with that.

If we moved them, I can't say that would end their collection efforts. It might make it more difficult. I don't know whether that is enough of a reason, but there are a lot of other reasons why we have to settle this problem with the Soviets.

SENATOR ROTH: Thank you, Judge Webster.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator Roth.
Senator Hollings.

SENATOR HOLLINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Webster, with respect to the present security breaches at the Moscow Embassy, we knowthey are

investigating the Marines. But this seems in some sense — the Marines are culpable, obviously, to me — to be an avoidance of responsibility. We hear you've got to put older people there, or married people. But Jim Bakker was married, too.

(General laughter.)

SENATOR HOLLINGS: And they avoid fixing responsibility. We can't find anybody responsible for the Challenger disaster, the Marine barracks -- I can go right on down. Even now, with Irangate, the process is flawed.

I am going to ask about your responsibility as
Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and
Title 18 USC 194(E)(1), which states that wherever
someone entrusted with the possession of classified
material — I am paraphrasing it — through gross
negligence allows it to be lost, stolen, destroyed, they
shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned more
than ten years. To me there is gross negligence
involved in the Moscow Embassy fracas. I talk as the
Chairman of the Subcommittee on State, Justice,
Commerce. We have already had a hearing with Secretary
of State Shultz. It was a closed hearing, but I can at
least say this. There is gross negligence there. The
Regional Security Officer and the Ambassador are the

ones in charge and the ones responsible.

Now, what are we doing about that? I know we're giving Marines polygraph tests, but we've also been promoting the RSO and congratulating the Ambassador. I think if you really want to get security at the embassies around this world, you nail an ambassador and a Regional Security Officer, and you won't have to worry anymore about the Marines and whether they are married or old or neuter or what.

So let's get responsibility and accountability.

Through gross negligence, we had a time sharing plan out there with the Soviets in Moscow.

(General laughter.)

SENATOR HOLLINGS: That is gross negligence. And what are we doing about it? Are you giving a polygraph to the RSO?

JUDGE WEBSTER: We have not been asked to do that yet, Senator.

SENATOR HOLLINGS: Yeah, but you're the head of the FBI. Who is going to ask you? You don't think the State Department is going to ask you. They're promoting people, the Ambassador and otherwise. I want to nail the responsible individuals. If you nail them, that will be better than buying all new buildings in the Inman Report for \$4 billion. If you fix

responsibility, you'll change that attitude that persisted in this particular embassy.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I certainly agree with you,
Senator, that it appears to be a long standing attitude
in the Moscow Embassy, and one that deserves a very
thorough review and change. We have in our other
responsibilities been calling attention for at least two
years to some of the vulnerabilities there. So far as
criminal investigations are concerned, I simply have no
answer for you. I will undertake to discuss this with
the Department of Justice to see whether or not there is
FBI jurisdiction for activities taking place abroad in
this way.

what we're doing is concentrating on the Marines, and that is fine; we call them in from all around the world and investigate. But we are avoiding the responsible individual. We are promoting him, and act like there is no responsibility. The process is flawed. I am tired of hearing that in this town. And if you nail a Regional Security Officer and an ambassador, who's really in charge, all ambassadors will wake up, and it won't cost us an extra cent. We won't have to build any more of these turrets that they're building, and pillboxes all around.

Let me ask another question quickly, because we're voting upstairs on the Budget Committee. Judge, take cognizance of the House report on the counterintelligence and security with respect to the They made a very thorough study, and I have the report here and we'll file it for you. But I take pride in the Central Intelligence Agency. I investigated it for the Hoover Commission back in 1954 and '55, when we had Allen Dulles, General Cabel and the others there. But now it seems to have fallen down on discipline. And the selecting of personnel is a key threat they list down here. The same old troubles that we found years ago with respect to ensuring that one particular agency informs the other of various security breaches. And of course you know the handling of the Yurchenko case. That was a disgrace. Nobody was responsible. I bet you they didn't discipline a top fellow at CIA for letting that fellow wander out of the Washington restaurant down the street back to the Soviet I bet you if they had nailed the top fellow in Embassy. charge of that particular program, that would never happen again. But they didn't. Nobody is responsible. We've got the Howard Case. How did he skip

We've got the Howard Case. How did he skip surveillance. You folks, the FBI, had him under surveillance, and he's in Moscow. What about that one?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We've got to get that one. Larry Chin and other are just part of a general breakdown. Maybe it is because of our good friend Mr. Casey's health or otherwise, but you've got a lot of work to do, taking over this particular agency, to bolster it. And I am confident you are the right man to, do it. I support you. But look at that House report and go over that very thoroughly for me, please.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I will, indeed.

SENATOR HOLLINGS: Thank you a lot, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Hollings.

Senator Hatch.

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR HATCH: Judge Webster, you've had some criticism for the time delay with regard to your first meeting with Attorney General Meese with regard to the Iran problem. Would you tell the Committee and the public at large how these investigations are really initiated and what really happened there.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Are you referring, Senator Hatch, to my meeting on November 21st?

SENATOR HATCH: Yes. I am referring to the 10 day delay that occurred.

JUDGE WEBSTER: You're referring to the Southern Air Freight matter?

SENATOR HATCH: That, plus the alleged criticism

•

SSCI FORM 23

that you failed to follow up when you knew there was a problem here. Let's start with Southern Air Transport.

JUDGE WEBSTER: All right. Your question has to do with the Attorney General's request through his Associate Attorney General, Stephen Trott, that we suspend for 10 days any unnecessary investigation of Southern Air Freight.

SENATOR HATCH: That was on October 30th.

JUDGE WEBSTER: On October 30th.

SENATOR HATCH: Right.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I received a telephone call from Mr. Trott relaying a message from the Attorney General. He wanted to know if it would be possible for us to suspend any unnecessary investigation — and those were his words — for about 10 days pending some sensitive hostage negotiations; that he did not want to interfere with the investigation, but he wanted to create, if possible, a good climate in which those negotiations could take place.

It is not unusual for the FBI itself to coordinate investigations that overlap each other where one investigation might get in the way of another investigation or available resources. I do what I normally would do. This was unusual in the sense that I do not normally get that kind of a request from the

Attorney General, but I called Assistant Director Floyd Clarke, who is in charge of our criminal investigative division, told him of the request, asked him about the status of our preliminary inquiry about Southern Air, and asked him whether the Attorney General's request would present any problems to us.

Mr. Clarke told me it would present no problems at all. We were barely into this investigation; that there was not much to do; that we had one more interview, second interview with an informant that would complete this relatively short inquiry; and he had no problems with accommodating this request.

I made that request a matter of record, and in that formal memorandum of my conversation, I instructed Mr. Clarke to inform me immediately if at any time that request became a problem for him in the investigation.

On -- without an exact date, I have it -- but about 10 days later they informed me, as they always do that the 10 days were up and would it be all right to go ahead with the investigations. And I said yes, indeed, 10 days are 10 days, and I called for Mr. Trott. Mr. Trott returned my call the next day. I asked if there were any problems in our going forward. Mr. Trott, on October 12th said he wasn't certain, he would get back and let us know. On October 20th, Mr. Trott advised

Mr. Revell, our Executive Assistant Director, that it was okay to proceed, and the bureaucratic process started in the Bureau to draft a Teletype to the field with those instructions. It took us longer than I was aware of, over a weekend and four or five or six days to get the teletype out, but I think that was indicative of the fact that a lot was going on at the time and that this investigation was never considered at that time to be one of major overriding importance.

But that is the process by which the Attorney General made the request, the process which I honored.

SENATOR HATCH: As I understand it, the Attorney General did not ask you to suspend urgent investigations; only non-urgent investigations.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Absolutely not. And that is included in my memorandum.

SENATOR HATCH: Right. I also noticed that in a memorandum, Subject: Investigation of Southern Air Transport, dated November 12th, 1986, from John L. Martin, Chief of the Internal Security Section of the Criminal Division, to William F. Weld, Assistant Attorney General, he attaches your memorandum dated October 31st, to Assistant Director Floyd Clarke of the Bureau's Criminal Investigative Division. The memomentions that this matter involves Eugene Hasenfus.

.1

This memorandum is dated November 12th, and said, "The Bureau is anxious to resume its investigation, but even though the 10 day period requested by Stave Trott has expired, it is unwilling to do so without the Department's approval. Unless you advise to the contrary, I intend to advise the Bureau that it is free to resume its investigation without further delay." And so that is another memorandum —

JUDGE WEBSTER: This is being handled at the level of the operational level between the Bureau people in charge of that program and Mr. Martin in the Department. So it was a dual contact with the Department on getting it going.

SENATOR HATCH: As I understand it, the first time you had any idea that there might have been a diversion of funds to the contras from the Iranian arms sales was when Mr. Meese gave his press conference on November 25th, I believe it was.

JUDGE WEBSTER: That is correct, Senator Hatch.

SENATOR HATCH: So you had no tip-off before that time.

JUDGE WEBSTER: None.

SENATOR HATCH: Okay. That is all I want to ask at this time, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COHEN: Senator Bradley.

,

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you, very much, Mr.

Chairman. I see we have a vote on. I assume we just proceed until the five bells.

Mr. Webster, I have been on the Intelligence
Committee for about two and a half years now. The last
Congress was referred to in some circles as the Congress
of the Spy. We have had already today mention made of
Howard and Whitworth and Walker and Pollard and Chin,
etc. And one of the things that has struck me is how
many Americans have actually sold information for money.
I imagine American citizen who enjoys the freedom of our
country betraying it for money. When things get tight
at home or you think you want to get rich quick, just
sell some information. Doesn't matter if it endangers
the national security of your country.

And the thing that occurs to me and I think it occurs to a lot of people is what would cause somebody to commit such an act and what can be done about it. We have heard today from various Senators who have talked about actions Congress can take and when that happens you always hear about extended use of polygraphs, tougher punishment, death penalty, etc., and then you usually hear Congress saying well, we need to revise procedures, and when the procedures are revised then we will have taken care of the problem.

But it occurs to me that those are not sufficient answers to what we have witnessed in the last couple of years. To me, the answer is probably more basic, more painful, more demanding, and maybe even more idealistic. And as someone who has had a remarkable record in 10 years at an institution such as the FBI, I wonder if you have given any thought to the larger question about what is it that causes people to sell information for money, to betray their country for money.

all thought about this, because you are absolutely right. In my entire time in the FBI I cannot think of any American citizen who was found and convicted of selling out to hostile intelligence services who did not accept money, with one exception. And that was an Air Force employee who gave away secrets because he was angry at the Air Force. But he did not have any ideological convictions that caused him to betray his country.

There is, in a sense, a rough, very rough analogy to the problems we face in our number one crime problem, drugs. We can do all the things in law enforcement and in legislation to make conduct illegal, but as long as there is demand for drugs, drugs will continue to come. And that is an educational process.

The number of people we have found who have betrayed their country -- and I am focusing on those who walked in, not those who were undone by various skilled recruiting devices of the Soviets -- is a relatively small number of people to the total numbers of people in this country who love the country, who honor its freedoms and would do nothing intentionally to betray it. So whatever I might say to you in answer to your question is not an indictment of the American people in whom I have tremendous confidence.

But I think where we do find these incidents and we track them back, we might — and I am only speculating — we might find in their education the absence of values. The concept of value neutral that I am hearing these days in the teaching profession is of concern to me. It seems to me that we have some traditions and loyalties that need to be fostered. When I was a child in school, history was very important to me. I don't think that we're teaching history in the way that we used to teach it. When I was a child in school, Nathan Hale was a hero and Benedict Arnold was a traitor, and the distinction was very, very clear. I am not sure that in today's world that there is not some numbness about national secrets and the damage that the selling of those national secrets can mean to us as a society,

1 2

as a country, and to us as individuals.

I think that everything I have said probably applies to those individuals who were found and convicted. I wouldn't want it to be any kind of indictment of our people as a whole. But we need some shoring up and we need to be sure that the importance of the work that individuals have who come into possession of our national secrets needs to be made as clear to them, the worthiness of their work, the trust that is represented by our allowing them to have these secrets should weigh in their conscience and in their minds before they knowingly sell out all that is so important to us.

I am not a psychologist. I am not a teacher, but I do believe that an awareness of our history and our traditions, a sense of worthiness of work, and the importance of preserving trust can be infused better than we seem to be doing it today with those people to whom much is entrusted. But I am glad that we only have a handful of these to deal with. I think the vast numbers of the people in the Central Intelligence Agency, the FBI, the NSA, the DIA and all the other places fully realize the importance of the responsibilities that have been given to them.

But it is something that I am glad to hear you ask,

and I hope others along the way will ask and find ways to build and reinforce that sense of responsibility and trust that is so important in our society.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you very much, Mr.

Director. I guess I have to go vote. Let me just say that I appreciate your statement and I take it to be a kind of resonance to something de Tocqueville once said when he said in America the spirit of liberty and the spirit of religion are in fundamental agreement.

SENATOR COHEN: The Committee is going to stand in recess for five minutes. Senator Boren will return.

(A brief recess was taken from 12:05 to 12:14 p.m.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will resume the hearing at this

point, and I will recognize Senator Specter. I believe

that Senator Bradley had a small amount of time

remaining to him when he had to leave to go to vote, and

if when he comes back he has one last question to ask,

we'll recognize him after Senator Specter has completed

his round of questioning. Senator Specter, you are

recognized.

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Webster, when you started your testimony this morning you had commented about a memorandum dated October 30th relating to certain information which had been withheld from the National Security Council. Would

you care to amplify the circumstances surrounding your adding that to your testimony before you began your prepared statement this morning.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think that the facts are that the information was reported to the Senate staff, and the Chairman and possibly the Vice Chairman asked for an explanation which was provided to them last night by members of my staff who had coordinated all of the records that might bear on this subject. And I concluded that I should add it even though I did not believe that the question, in letter or spirit, required it, but in order that you might have a full record.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, the Committee's questionnaire had the question as to your knowledge of any possible illegal activities of U.S. officials in aid of the contras. And as you have noted, you had not put that on your response. As I understand the facts, there was a memorandum provided by Independent Counsel to the Intelligence Committee which contained your initials and where the FBI had decided not to make certain information available to the National Security Council --

JUDGE WEBSTER: To Lieutenant North.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, it was to the National Security Council, because Lieutenant Colonel North might

.

have access to it in the context that there was a possible criminal prosecution which might be brought or the appointment of Independent Counsel to investigate Lieutenant Colonel North's activities with respect to the contras. Is that essentially the situation?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator, have you had a chance to read my statement?

SENATOR SPECTER: I heard and made notes of the statement that you gave this morning, Judge Webster.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I am not sure I understand your question. I would like to answer it carefully.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, my first question is that the addendum which you added this morning was due to the fact that Independent Counsel advised the Intelligence Committee yesterday of a memorandum dated October 30th which was initialed by you where the FBI had decided not to make certain information available because of concern that it might come to the attention of Lieutenant Colonel North who might be the subject of an investigation by an Independent Counsel.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, that is substantially correct. The document said that the Department official had recommended that Lieutenant North not be informed about the information contained in the memorandum.

SENATOR SPECTER: According to the information I

have, the Counsel for the Intelligence Policy of the FBI was concerned in somewhat direct language about Colonel North potentially being in trouble, Colonel North potentially being flaky, and concerned that the information which the FBI had acquired not be made available to Lieutenant Colonel North because he might be the subject of an investigation where Independent Counsel might be involved. Is that correct?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The memorandum contained a note from an FBI employee saying that with respect to that information, the Departmental official had recommended that it not be given to Lieutenant Colonel North because he might become the subject of an Independent Counsel — I want to correct that — that he might be involved in an Independent Counsel probe and besides, it was redundant because that information was already available in the media.

SENATOR SPECTER: And the recommendation by the FBI official that Lieutenant Colonel North not have access to this information because he might be involved in a probe initiated by Independent Counsel, that recommendation was approved by you and initialed by you on a memorandum.

JUDGE WEBSTER: This was not a recommendation -- coming to me in a recommendation form. This was an

information note, the kind that I get dozens of a day, that simply put on there that it had recommended. I did not participate. I did not sign an approval. My initials are just scribbled on the bottom of the page. It was for my information.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, your initials, though, were scribbled, as you point out, on the bottom of the page, indicating your agreement with the recommendation not to make the information available to Lieutenant Colonel North.

JUDGE WEBSTER: It really didn't indicate anything other than I had read the memorandum, because I was not the one making that decision. It was not sent to me for approval; it was sent to me for information.

SENATOR SPECTER: Judge Webster, the issue becomes somewhat important in the context of the fact that that memo was simply one day before you wrote this memorandum to Mr. Clarke which you have already testified about, requesting that there be a delay in the investigation of Southern Air Transport. This memorandum asks to suspend the investigation of any non-urgent work that could — and you used the word — wreck the investigation. Did you see any connection between the information which had come to the FBI concerning the contras and concerning Hasenfus and the request which you made the very next

day to delay this investigation.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Let me make a couple of observations to answer as candidly and completely as I can. First, I have no independent recollection of that memorandum at all, other than that my initials appear on it. It was typical of the kind that came in large batches of an informational variety in which I was not being asked to act, but simply being informed.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, you say you have no independent recollection of it when you filled out the Intelligence Committee questionnaire. But how about --

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's right. And it was certainly not on my mind at the time that the Attorney General called through his Associate Attorney General. I do not even know, Senator, that I read that particular piece — had read it by the time that I had that conversation with him. Often those informational notes are taken home. Sometimes they may be a day or two if I am in travel. These are not action things; they are informationAL things. So I can't explain it. I had no recollection of it. I certainly know that I did not have it in my mind at the time that Mr. Trott called to inquire whether I would have any problem.

Further, I have consulted with Mr. Clarke who is the Assistant Director in charge of the Criminal

SSCI FORM 23

Investigative Division who is the one I consulted to determine whether there would be any problem in suspending it, and he has no recollection of that memorandum, although he also saw it on an informational basis. I am trying to suggest that that information was acted on at a very low level.

And as I emphasized in my statement -- and then I will take your next question -- but as I emphasized in my statement there is nothing in the memoranda, that is, that contains the information that the Justice Department official proposed not be given to Mr. North, Colonel North, there is nothing in that memorandum that refers to Lieutenant Colonel North or to any other United States government official or in any way suggests that any United States government official was involved in illegal activity in Central America. And therefore I did not believe and I do not believe now that it was called for as an answer to your question. But I wanted to put it in because you had raised it.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, I can understand your point that you may not have remembered it when you filled out the Intelligence Committee questionnaire. But here we have two events, one on October 30th and one on October 31st, and it seems to me that it is not so inconsequential that confidential information comes to

the FBI which the FBI decides not to transmit to a circle where it may come to the attention of Lieutenant Colonel North, and that even as you characterize your scribbling notes, that it is a fairly significant matter on your making a notation of any sort in agreement apparently not to have the disclosure to Lieutenant Colonel North. This is especially so in the context wherein the very next day you send a memorandum requesting a delay of 10 days in the investigation relating to Southern Air Transport.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Specter, it was the same day, if you want to be precise. I wrote the memorandum the next day.

SENATOR SPECTER: Okay, the same day.

JUDGE WEBSTER: But I have already told you, I don't even know whether I read that memorandum on the same day. This is reading material, the kind of stuff that went home with me.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, now, wait a --

JUDGE WEBSTER: And I don't remember it at all.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, Judge Webster, are you saying you scribbled your initials on a piece of paper that you don't even know if you read?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I didn't say that. I said I don't know -- I don't know when I read it. By putting

 my initials on it, I meant I had read it.

SENATOR SPECTER: Are you saying that you may have read it after October 31st?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes, I may have.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, if you read it after

October 31st, didn't you make any connection between

some information that the FBI had decided not to make

available to Lieutenant Colonel North and --

JUDGE WEBSTER: I did not make the --

SENATOR SPECTER: -- and a request to have a suspension for 10 days of an investigation relating to Southern Air Transport which involved the same locale and perhaps overlapping areas.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I did not, Senator, and if you look at the --well, you don't have -- I assume that you've had access to the memorandum. It has apparently been provided to you. The memorandum doesn't talk about Lieutenant Colonel North.

SENATOR SPECTER: The memorandum has not been provided to us, Judge Webster. I have a memorandum of the staffer who read the memorandum, and I think we ought to have the memorandum, and I intend, speaking for myself, to make an effort to get it.

JUDGE WEBSTER: You understand, Senator, that memorandum is in the possession of the Independent

Counsel and was provided by the FBI.

SENATOR SPECTER: Let me ask you one more question. We have a vote on and perhaps I can come back to this in a later round. You have testified that you had no reason to suspect that there was a criminal investigation or a potentially criminal investigation when you had the conversation with Attorney General Meese on November 21st. You have testified that the issue of the Iranian arms sale came to your attention, I believe you said, in the summer of — when was it, in response to Senator Cohen's question, that you said you had some information about —

JUDGE WEBSTER: As nearly as we can determine by tracking it back to a Criminal Investigative Division briefing, it was on October 5, 1986.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, Judge Webster, you have had a number of indications which surround the issue. Some information comes to your attention on October 5th, 1986, which you consider to be of sufficient importance to call to the attention of the Attorney General to see if he knows about it and to see if there has been a Finding. Shortly before that time there is information which comes to the FBI that you decide ought not to be made available to Lieutenant Colonel North. At about the same time there is a request which comes to you, and

it is obviously an important matter because you put it in this memorandum. And then on November 21st you have a conversation with the Attorney General about the Iranian arms sale and there must have been some question about compliance with the Export Administration Act or the Arms Export Control Act. Why in that context, given your experience, was there no red light flashed that perhaps there ought to be some greater concern about an appropriate role for the FBI.

JUDGE WEBSTER: It was a judgment call, Senator.

I did not see it. You can fault me for not seeing it,
but I didn't see it. And I certainly didn't remember
that piece of paper that you're talking about or have it
in my mind.

SENATOR SPECTER: Had Mr. Meese told you that the issue did involve the sale of arms to Iran when you talked to him on November 21st?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The conversation was relatively brief. I was the one who told him what I had been informed, and he confirmed that yes, he was aware of that, and that yes, he had seen the Finding or a draft of it and had given his approval to it.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, that is the October 5th, 1986 conversation between you and Mr. Meese, where you

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I think that would be shortly after August. August 5th was the --

SENATOR SPECTER: About August the 5th.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, it would have been within a few days. It might have been that same day or a few days after that.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, all right. You have this conversation with him on August 5th. Leave out the business as to keeping information from Lieutenant Colonel North and the Southern Air Transport matters which occur on October 30th and 31st or thereabouts, and just pick up the August 5th conversation with Mr. Meese about the sale of arms to Iran. Also, pick up on your concern about whether arms are being sold to a state which sponsors terrorism, and on the information of November 21st where you have a conversation with Mr. Meese about his inquiries relating to the Iranian arms sale. Wasn't there some concern on your part about possible violation of the Export Administration Act or the Arms Control Export Act, that there may be some criminal overtone to this matter.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I can tell you that there was not. Most of those acts relate to Customs, and the Attorney General was not -- we were not thinking in terms of or speaking in terms of looking for what kinds

of laws had been violated, but looking for what had actually happened -- trying to get the facts straight.

SENATOR SPECTER: But, there was the sale of arms to Iran and the Export Administration Act bars the export of goods and commodities to any nation which the Secretary of State has determined supports international Communism. And Secretary Shultz had made that determination. And the Arms Export Control Act regulates transfers of arms generally and specifically bars items on the munitions list to any nation which the President determines supports international terrorism.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I could raise the question of whether a Presidential Finding would have superseded any Finding by the Secretary of State, but there's really no point in that because we were not thinking about the Export/Import Arms Control Act which is not normally an area in which the FBI is active.

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you, Judge Webster. My time has expired. I'll come back to it the next round.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator

Specter. Senator Bradley has returned, and he has three minutes remaining on his time for questioning, and then we will continue with questions by Senator DeConcini.

So, the Chair will go over to the floor to vote. And, so, Senator DeConcini if you would take up the

questioning just as soon as Senator Bradley completes his line of questioning, by then I should be back.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, do I understand that we will have Mr. Webster for a closed hearing?

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are any classified questions that need to be asked, we will. We had planned to come back in open session this afternoon at two o'clock. There are many more questions that Members have indicated to me they wish to address in the open session. If Members do have matters dealing with classified information or questions about which you'd like a ruling as to whether or not they deal with classified information, if you would inform the Chair. Then we will decide either later this afternoon or tomorrow about a closed session. But, we'll resume an open session at two o'clock. We'll complete your questions and then Senator DeConcini's and see if there are others that wish to ask questions before we break. We'll break no later than about ten minutes to one.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you very much, Mr.

Chairman. Mr. Webster, I'd like to move to another

area. I appreciate your response to the last one, and I

really hope that people read your response because I

think it was an important response given our current

environment.

One of the challenges that you will face is how to take the CIA to a new level of public acceptability and responsibility. In this connection, how you conduct yourself in the position as the head of the whole Central Intelligence apparatus is very important. the extent that you are almost above politics, as you have been, that is also very important. That leads me to a question relating to the criteria that you would apply to your public speeches and your writings. question has arisen in the immediate past as to whether the Director didn't actually become a part of the policy advocacy process; didn't actually take a very direct and even quasi-partisan position on issues before the Congress. And I wonder if you could share with us the criteria you would have for determining what you would speak out on and what you would write about.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think, Senator Bradley, that first of all I would probably proceed pretty much as I have done during the past nine years in the FBI, and that is wherever possible and appropriate to take advantage of opportunities to explain to the American people the role of Central Intelligence, the need for it, how intelligence is gathered in general terms, and, at least in those areas that can be publicly discussed, made as clear as possible. I have great confidence in

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the American people to support something that makes sense and something that they know is necessary. From time to time over the last nine years it has been necessary for me to publicly explain, and often defend, techniques, operations, events that are understandably confusing to the public. And, I presume I would be prepared to do that. I do not believe that I would be asked to, nor would I want to engage, in any advocacy of political policy. I've tried to stay as far away from that as I can in order not to create the perception that I am -- that either I am politically motivated or that the quality of intelligence upon which our policymakers are expected to act is influenced by political or personal bias. I am concerned that on some campuses we are beginning to see signs that the CIA may not be as welcome as we would like it to be. And that concerns me because of the enormous pool of tremendously talented scholars and thinkers and analysts that we have to draw on in order to produce the quality analysis that makes the CIA the premier intelligence agency in the world. And, unless we continue to have support and understanding on our campuses and in other places of education and advanced knowledge, we are not going to have that kind of person to continue to work in the CIA. So I need to be out talking to those people. If your

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

question was directed, would I be a partisan advocate for particular causes, the answer is no. If someone were to ask me while I was making a speech what is behind a particular policy and I understand it, I think I would try to answer the question in the same way that I answer similar questions in the FBI. What was the reason for the President's decision to punish Libya for the LaBelle discotheque.

I think that needs to be explained. But I think I must be always careful to do it in ways that would not suggest that the intelligence is --

SENATOR BRADLEY: Let's say that --

SENATOR COHEN: The Senator's time has expired.

There are two others waiting. Do you want to yield?

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Not necessarily. But I think it's a unanimous consent to let him finish that question. I thought he was in the middle of something.

SENATOR BRADLEY: If I could just -- very quickly. Let's assume you got a call from a White House, and there was a big vote coming up in Congress, and then sometime in the next three weeks it would be very helpful for the head of Central Intelligence to make a statement that could be used in the overall effort to achieve the policy objective.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I'd view that with a lot of

suspicion. I've had requests from time to time to state views on such things as the Foreign Intelligence
Surveillance Act, and I think that in the sense that it effects anything -- any legislation that effects the CIA -- I would be entitled to make a statement. But just simply to roll drum beats to make room for high level speeches is not the role of the Director of Central Intelligence.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COHEN: Senator DeConcini.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Judge Webster, I want to go back in time because I've never quite understood the problem in the Donovan confirmation and the FBI's involvement in that hearing. At the time of that confirmation hearing for the Secretary of Labor, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the FBI told the Committee that its investigation of Mr. Donovan had been "thorough and complete." Those are quotes. And, "had surfaced no information which would reflect unfavorable upon Mr. Donovan." Yet, according to a Teletype sent from the New York field office to the FBI Headquarters, dated January 10, 1981, with which I presume you're familiar.

The Tumcon cases Masselli tapes revealed conversations in which schemes to defraud the New York Transit Authority, through the use of a phony minority business enterprise, JOPEL Construction Company, and other misdeeds of overcharging and what have you, were discussed by William Masselli and the executives at Shiavone Construction Company. Mr. Donovan and his fellow Schiavone executives are now standing trial, as you know, in New York on evidence taken from these tapes and other evidence. I want to know, Judge Webster, can you tell the Committee why these serious allegations about Ray Donovan's social and business ties to organized crime and his possible involvement in fraudulent contracts were not revealed to the Senate Labor Committee during the confirmation proceedings.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator DeConcini, there was a lot that was wrong with that investigation. And in extensive hearings chaired by Senator Hatch those facts came out fully.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: In the confirmation hearings? Excuse me?

JUDGE WEBSTER: In confirmation hearings and even in separate hearings before that. The FBI executive who made that statement I really believe thought it was true at the time, but the investigation was not as thorough

and complete as we would expect in any present day confirmation. It was done in a manner consistent with past Presidential nominations, but in reviewing it I have to say very candidly that the summaries that we provided the White House, which was consistent with past practice, were inadequate -- inadequate to alert the President's counsel that there were serious and specific problems that he might want to address and, in fact, inform the Congress about. When we gathered up what information that we had -- and we really did try in that one to reach further than we had in the other Cabinet offices. We didn't capture it all. Very substantial changes have taken place since that time and the systems -- the automation systems, the rules, the practices. Even the form in which we supply information to the White House with respect to Presidential nominations has been substantially changed so that nothing we say will mislead.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Judge Webster, when the confirmation hearings and report was sent up did you have already in your possession the January 10, 1981, Teletype from the New York FBI office? Or do you know?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I just don't know the answer to that, Senator.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Could you find out for me? I'm

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

1 2

concerned that this type of information --

JUDGE WEBSTER: We'll certainly answer it promptly for the record.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: I'm concerned that this type of information, a copy of which was provided to be by the District Attorney's office, may not have been given to the Labor Committee. Do you know what happened to it? Maybe it wasn't sent to the Headquarters as they say it was. But if it was sent to Headquarters, how would it not wind up in the file for either your review or your chief deputy's review?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I'm confident today that would not happen.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: It would not because of procedural changes?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Did anyone from the White House, or particularly Fred Fielding, request that these allegations, or this type of information, not be sent to the Committee?

JUDGE WEBSTER: There was one time when there was some question about further interviews and whether further interviews were necessary, and I think Mr. Fielding said that he didn't believe that they were. And I believe that our agent working the case didn't

think so either. But I know of no situation in which White House counsel intentionally withheld any information the White House counsel had. I think the problem was that we gave some of that information in such summarized form and then those working with it really believed that that information was all incorporated in some very general summaries. Now we provide all derogatory information in the form in which it is received, so there can be no doubt about what the counsel was actually told.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Judge Webster, my question is did the White House, particularly Fielding or anybody else, request that these particular allegations or any other allegations not be forwarded to the Committee?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator DeConcini, I can recall no such request by the White House.

perhaps you don't have this at your fingertips -- when you did learn of these allegations and the information which was not available to the Committee during Mr. Donovan's confirmation process, and then how much time elapsed before you transmitted it. If that period of time was longer than a reasonable time of 30 or 60 days, why was it not transmitted?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I am trying to relate your question

16.

to what I knew. I did not know the substance of Mr.

Mullin's testimony until later that summer when I -- as
I recall, I received a letter from Senator Hatch
referring to the testimony, and suggesting that perhaps
it was incomplete. It had to do with information that
was on lengthy wiretaps, some 1500 hours of wiretaps in
New Jersey. One -- as I recall one, possibly two
references to Mr. Donovan's company had been made on
those tapes that had been reported to me before the
confirmation began, with the information that those
references did not refer to anything criminal, any
criminal activity.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: You mean as to the information that was referred to you.

JUDGE WEBSTER: That was referred to me.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Not as to the whole tapes.

JUDGE WEBSTER: No. No. The full tape was not actually transcribed until the Independent Counsel was appointed, and it took some six or eight of his people several weeks to listen to those tapes, and I think that they found five or six additional references to the company and possibly even to Mr. Donovan in doing that.

That information was really not available to us in the form in which it was held. We did know that there were references in the tape to Mr. Donovan -- rather, to

1 2

3

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

his company, at least -- and that information was not given to the Senate during his confirmation. I did not know that --

SENATOR DeCONCINI: That it was not given.

JUDGE WEBSTER: -- that it was not given, and I did not know that it had been asked for.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Judge Webster, can you tell us what is the procedure that you have implemented to prevent this from happening today? If we had a nominee for another Cabinet position, what guarantees do we have that, in fact, the Director or your chief subordinate would have all the information that you know of within the Federal Bureau, and that all available information would be sent up to the appropriate Committee and its Chairman and Ranking Member.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I missed the first part. You say

SENATOR DeCONCINI: What procedures have been implemented now so that this won't happen again and doesn't happen now. What is the change in procedures?

JUDGE WEBSTER: We now have procedures for calling in field information and for automating the information that is available to us, both from the field and at headquarters. We have procedures for identifying derogatory information and giving it in the form in

which it is received to the White House so that it is not incorporated in some sort of gross summary of the facts. I think the reviewing procedures have been tightened up, and I could supply for the record, if you wish, a list of those changes.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: I would like to see them, Judge, if you could provide the. My time is up.

But let me say that I think this is very candid of you and very typical of the way you operate. Indeed, it appears from the little bit that I know, and I am not on the Labor Committee, that indeed something was left out in that confirmation hearing — a very important something as to Mr. Donovan. I ended up voting against him, and I can't even remember exactly why now, but in retrospect I am very glad I did. But it might have been my concern that all the information wasn't there.

Still, I can appreciate that errors happen or procedure change. I think it would be helpful to this Senator and perhaps the record if you would supply what those changes are and what the process is now, by providing a summary position paper which could be put in the record.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would be happy to do that.

SENATOR DeCONCINI: Thank you, Judge Webster.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Senator

DeConcini.

Let me explain to the members of the Committee the situation in which we find ourselves. We have some members of the Committee who have been waiting to ask their questions who cannot return this afternoon. As I understand it, they have other conflicts. What I would like to do is give them an opportunity, Judge Webster, if we could go on maybe another 20 minutes or so this morning.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, I am at your service, as long as you would like.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will return about 2:10 after that. If I could ask my colleagues, since we've had the Judge here now for almost three hours, if there is any way you can constrain the length of the questions. We want to give you every opportunity and we'll have more rounds of questioning this afternoon. But we want to give you a chance, because I know some have scheduling problems.

Senator Hecht.

SENATOR HECHT: Good afternoon Judge, how are you?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Good afternoon Senator.

SENATOR HECHT: Judge, in my particular state of Nevada, there's been a lot of question about how you have handled some FBI agents and I'm bringing this up

SSCI FORM 23

because this is very relative to your confirmation, how you hope to handle CIA agents.

Maybe the question I'd like to submit have been raised by newspapers, the <u>Las Vegas Sun</u>, with your permission I'm going to have a lot of these articles included in the record.

(The newspaper articles referred to follow:)

SSCI FORM 23

SENATOR HECHT: As you are aware, last year the Senate voted to impeach Judge Claiborne and remove him from office. At the same time, the Senate approved an investigation into the way Judge Claiborne was targeted by the FBI and the conduct of those who conducted the investigation. Are you satisfied with that investigation, headed by then FBI Las Vegas Chief Joseph Yablonsky, was conducted properly by the book?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Hecht, I am satisfied that with respect to the investigation of Judge Claiborne, the head of our office in Las-Vegas carried out his responsibilities in the manner appropriate and in a lawful manner. I guess that's your question, did he break any laws or break any rules. There were other things that occurred out there that I'm not so proud of, but in terms of the investigation, I am satisfied that there was a proper predicate to initiate the investigation. That evidence came forward that formed the basis for a Grand Jury investigation and an indictment. There was a hung jury, and the case was retried. Senator Claiborne was convicted. He had exhausted his appeals before he came before this Senate on impeachment charges. In no where in any of that did I find anything that would require a disciplinary action or administrative action of my officials out there.

1

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That investigation was under the supervision of the public integrity division section of the Department of Justice. I was a participant in passing on and carefully reviewing various proposals to deal with Senator Claiborne during that investigation.

SENATOR WARNER: Judge Claiborne.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I beg your pardon. What did I say?

SENATOR WARNER: He was here for only a short time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you referred to him as Senator Claiborne.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would withdraw and apologize for that. But I say won't that I agreed with everything that was proposed to be done, because I didn't, and I exercised my responsibility to modify various proposals. But I am not aware that the special agent in charge went beyond his authority when I gave it to him.

SENATOR HECHT: Why was Judge Claiborne targeted by Mr. Yablonsky?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would, Senator, very respectfully disagree with the term targeting. He was not targeted. Information came to the FBI through a fugitive in, at that time, another country, that he wanted in exchange for favorable consideration of his situation to give evidence to the government of a bribe paid by him to then Mr. Claiborne, and I think -- I'm not sure of the

exact time -- of a bribe to Judge Claiborne. We interviewed the prospective witness, got further information. Other collaborative information came from other individuals including a former Assistant United State Attorney. We went forward with that investigation. And in the course of that investigation, evidence of income tax evasion came forward and that formed the basis for an additional charge, in fact, for the charge for which he was finally convicted. That was handled with the Internal Revenue Service and of course the United States Attorneys out there were in charge of the investigation locally.

SENATOR HECHT: For the record I want to point out that the individual which was from another country was an American citizen, and a man of questionable integrity, the owner of a licensed brothel, and on this particular type of an individual you relied on his testimony.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator, we didn't rely on his testimony, we took his testimony and reached out for other collaborating facts to determine whether or not he was telling the truth. We get information from the worst kind of people.

(General laughter.)

JUDGE WEBSTER: And it doesn't mean their evidence

21.

23 ·

is untrue. It means we have to be careful about it.

SENATOR HECHT: Why did you send Mr. Yablonsky to
Las Vegas?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I sent, I chose Mr. Yablonsky for Las Vegas, and I take responsibility for having done so. He was doing a very good job in the Cincinnati Office. He was, he had developed a significant reputation in undercover activity. I was concerned that while we had substantial indications of organized crime involvement in Las Vegas and the casinos with tentacles reaching from Chicago and Kansas City, we had not been successful in dealing with organized crime out there, and I thought he was the one to go out and do something about it.

SENATOR HECHT: How do you feel about the situation now?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think he did a very good job.

Las Vegas is a difficult climate in which to live, and I think he made some mistakes, some personal mistakes, for which he was accountable and was held to account. But in terms of his investigative efforts, when I look at the indictments that came down during his tenure there, I am very pleased that I sent him.

SENATOR HECHT: How often were you briefed by Mr. Yablonsky during the course of the Claiborne investigation?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The normal course of events is that the special agents in charge do their reporting to the Criminal Investigative Division, and then I receive informational notes from that division which manages the programs. And that is the way this generally occurred. From time to time, Mr. Yablonsky would request authority to do certain things of a sensitive nature, and those would be elevated to senior officials and often to me for determination. If I thought it were necessary to talk to him personally, I would do so, and on at least one trip, to Las Vegas, I had an extensive conference with him and with the people out there with respect to their work.

SENATOR HECHT: Did you ever caution him to stay within the bounds of the law during the investigation?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I don't know that I ever used those terms, because he never proposed to do anything outside the law. But from time to time, I exercised my responsibility in limiting certain activities in order to protect -- what I considered to be -- to protect the investigation from possible compromise by a very wily subject.

SENATOR HECHT: Mr. Chairman, my time is up, but I wish to have time to continue this pursuit of questions at a later time.

SSCI FORM 23

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly Senator Hecht. We'll have more rounds of questions this afternoon and every Member of the Committee will have a chance to ask every question they wish to ask.

SENATOR HECHT: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Cranston.

SENATOR CRANSTON: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I welcome you to this Committee.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Thank you Senator.

SENATOR CRANSTON: You come before us at a time of strain and stress for the Intelligence Community in the wake of the Iran/Contra matters. It is very important to have someone of experience and integrity and very good judgment assuming the role of leading the Intelligence Community. From all that I've gathered this far, you're highly qualified for this nomination, and subject to whatever may come up in the scope of these hearings, I expect you're going to be confirmed, and I will be one of those very happy to join in that confirmation.

I do want to ask you some questions that relate to something that happened in California a while ago. This hearing gives me the opportunity to do that. According to press reports the FBI started an investigation of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine some three

years ago. Some of my questions you may not want to answer in open session, some you may want to go back to look at the files, but let me ask you what prompted your investigation at that time of the PFLP?

understanding the constraints that I am under in responding to that question. The PLFP is a world-wide organization which has been extremely violent in its activities. It has claimed credit and been involved in such incidents as the shootings in Munich and the hi-jacking of the famous plane that went to Entebbe. A number of Americans have been victims of the PFLP terrorist activity. There was a substantial basis under the Attorney General Guidelines to conduct investigations of this organization and the individuals in that organization who might — who we had reason to believe might be engaged in terrorist activity. That was the basis for opening the investigation.

SENATOR CRANSTON: Did you have any reason to believe that the group was actually engaged in or planning to engage in terrorist activities in this country?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Taken as a whole, I think we had reason to believe that there were plans in operation of a terrorist nature. With all that is going on in the

Middle East we have an awareness of infrastructures in the United States which could form the basis for support mechanisms if individual groups chose to retaliate or to engage in terrorist activities here in this country, and that goes across a number of such organizations. The individuals who were arrested in California had not been found to have engaged themselves in terrorist activity.

SENATOR CRANSTON: I understand that the

Immigration Service actually carried out the arrest of
the PFLP members for deportation purposes. But the
arrests were based on information provided by the FBI
concerning the organization and activities of the
individuals, is that correct?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I believe that is correct, Senator.

SENATOR CRANSTON: Press reports allege there was
mistreatment of the arrested people by the Immigration
Service agents, not by FBI agents. Were FBI agents
present during the arrest?

JUDGE WEBSTER: FBI agents were present at the arrest for the purpose of being in a position to interview any of those arrested who wished to cooperate. We did not make the arrest.

SENATOR CRANSTON: Are you looking into the charges of mistreatment of the people during the arrest by the

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

1415

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2425

Immigration officials, or do you have any information on that?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Of course I have spoken to Mr. Allen Nelson, the head of the Immigration Service, and he has ordered an Office of Professional Responsibility investigation into the allegations. WQe had originally had started a civil rights investigation but were advised by the Department that we did not have a basis for that and that we should close our investigation and rely upon what should be developed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which was looking into it. We've also conducted some internal inquiries as a result of some of the news reports, particularly an article by Mr. Anthony Lewis, that referred to mistreatment of a woman. I think her name is Vitar; it's close to that, We do not believe -- we know that no agent of the FBI participated in it. We do not have any evidence of any others. Mr. Nelson is looking for any that he can find, and the attorney for the woman has not made her available for us to interview, so that we can do anything further about it. But if there is any way for us to put that to rest, I certainly want to do so.

SENATOR CRANSTON: What was the reason for the arrests being made for deportation purposes of the alleged members? Was that a technical, legal reason,

were they apprehended for deportation because they were "members of a Communist" organization.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Cranston, I believe that some of them were out of status and that would be information, I believe, developed by the INS. But all of them were arrested because they are alleged to be members of a world-wide Communist organization which under the McCarran Act makes them eligible for deportation as foreign nationals.

SENATOR CRANSTON: So in a way, it was like arresting a gangster for parking by a fire hydrant?. Do you think that we need to revise the laws that are available for this purpose? Are we using the wrong tool to address a legitimate concern about terrorism and terrorist operatives in the United States?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's entirely up to Congress, because in this particular case if these individuals had been United States citizens, there would not have been a basis for their arrest.

SENATOR CRANSTON: Is there any law that would enable you to focus more narrowly on aliens who are actively involved in clandestine terrorist activities, rather than needing this broader law about membership in a Communist apparatus? In your opinion, would it be helpful to have a law that would be more precise?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think it would be helpful to have a law that was more precise and was treated as a more serious incident than just civil deportation.

SENATOR CRANSTON: Under what circumstances does the FBI conduct warrantless searches for intelligence purposes? Is the PFLP the kind of group that might fit the criteria for a warrantless search based on inherent executive powers?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Our warrantless searches are based upon, first they are based upon the inherent authority of the President to protect the national security and his ability to delegate that authority to the Attorney General, who has in turn, formulated foreign counterintelligence guidelines which include international terrorist activity. I'm not able to respond to the question specifically because the guidelines themselves are classified. I simply can give you the basis upon which, if a search were conducted, it would be under that line of authority that I described to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Cranston, we could either pursue that further in a closed session or if you wish to have the Director answer a classified question in writing, that could also be done and made a part of the classified part of our record.

SENATOR CRANSTON: If you could respond in writing, that would be helpful.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Cranston will direct the question in writing and there could be a response in writing which would be a classified portion of the record.

SENATOR CRANSTON: My time is about up, so I, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Again Judge Webster, I'm speaking as a citizen. I'm very pleased that you are willing to take on this challenge and put in an additional period of public service.

I want to return to the discussions that I think my colleagues, Senator Nunn and Senator Cohen probed about the role of the President's Chief Advisor on Intelligence matters and the relationship with a President. And your reference to the thought as to what role politics plays in this. Would you care to sort of set the foundation here of your views as to how you hope to relate to your President and particularly what role, if any, politics plays. Now I notice that you've never sought political office; you've apparently have not been a member of a political party; and with your nomination, we've come full circle from your predecessor who was one

SSCI FORM 23

of the campaign managers for the President, to a person, yourself, who has not been affiliated in any way. I think it would be helpful to me if you would clarify your views with respect to what if any role politics plays in your discharge of your responsibilities in the office and with your relationship with the President.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Senator Warner, I have to make a confession that for the first 30 years of my life I harbored the idea that I wanted to be a United States Senator.

(General laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Fortunately, that may be the most damaging admission so far.

(General laughter.)

JUDGE WEBSTER: Fortunately, as you see from the gentleman who -- distinguished gentleman who introduced me this morning, I didn't have to pursue that arduous task. But I do believe that there are certain jobs in which you, if you're going to hold them properly, you have to stand away from political activity and political concerns even to the point of missing some fund-raising dinners from time to time, which hasn't been all that arduous.

SENATOR WARNER: I clearly agree with you in terms of partisan political activities. But the CIA,

SSCI FORM 23

particularly now that we're going to strip from the National Security Council the responsibility, which I doubt they ever really had, for covert operations.

You're going to be the Chief Operator for this President and perhaps the next President. Of covert operations, and indeed the very essence of a covert operation, it is a political judgment by a President that certain assets of this nation shall be employed in a foreign land to further the interest of our country, primarily our national security. Now that's a political decision. Let's suppose that you were called into the Oval Office by a President, and he indicated that he has made a finding, that it is his judgment that we should pursue a certain covert action. Having had some knowledge of this beforehand, you did your own independent research and you wish to disagree with the President. I'm sure, because I have known you personally and professionally, you would in the strongest of terms necessary, take him by the collar, say Mr. President, you've received bad advice and I caution you in the interest of our country. But then after receiving your advice and all the other advice, he makes a decision, we will, the United States, follow this covert course of action. It seems to me that you have one of two choices and they are very clear. You

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

either salute, march off and implement that cover action. Or you submit your resignation. Now have I succinctly stated that case as you understand it?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think that's correct Senator, and I think the choice would depend upon whether I thought that my disagreement was so fundamental and that the President's decision was so arbitrary that I could not remain a part of it. I don't expect that in positions like Director of Central Intelligence or the Director of the FBI that in relation to the Attorney General, that you have the right to thumb your nose at the authority that has been placed there by the American people in the President, just because you disagree. But if your disagreement is fundamental, and you know that the action is arbitrary and wrong, you can't stay, and you cannot in conscience support it, you've got to leave. There isn't any option.

SENATOR WARNER: I'm most reassured by that response and it clarifies that area. Now I bring you to an example on the 30th of October which we reviewed in the hearing this morning. Attorney General Meese asked the FBI to suspend its investigation. Did you, at that time, try to make any independent inquiry into why that was being asked and to whether or not you should exercise your judgment to say to the Attorney General, I

disagree with the propriety of that course of action or did you just accept his request and act accordingly?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, Senator. The first thing that I did was to ask my own executive subordinates who are in charge of those programs whether suspension would adversely infect the investigation. In other words, I sought a professional opinion on the impact of the request. From what I already knew, that there were sensitive arms initiatives going on in Iran and efforts to release the hostages, and that the hostage activity was getting sensitive, that was in my view a reasonable request with which I did not disagree because my own people had told me that it would not get in the way of our operation. I was careful, I thought, to include in my confirming memorandum making it a matter of record, that I wanted to know if at any time, it became a problem. And I think that this is one of the important aspects of my responsibility if I'm selected for DCI -that in these findings, or these decisions, that we make sure that they be revisited, that they be reviewed and that they be tested in the light of new circumstances. And I wanted to be sure that in that particular case that I knew if something changed -- why we should be back in to this rather low-level investigation if it became important. They were to tell me, and they would

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

have.

SENATOR WARNER: You've had an extensive record of distinguished public service and now you take on this new post following the confirmation of the Senate of which I am certain. Do you bring to this office your own agenda, a set of goals that you would like to see accomplished and would those goals in any way vary from those of your immediate predecessor? Or from, should we say, the traditional role of the Director of Central Intelligence?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I hesitate to answer that question, because naturally, I don't know all of the goals of my predecessor. I know the many great things he achieved for the CIA in terms of morale and resources and momentum. I think it would perhaps be a mistake for me to speak as to his goals when he is not able to speak for them himself.

I tend to a traditional view of the role of the Director of Central Intelligence. I believe that the most important thing that that agency does, that the CIA does, and the coordinate elements of the intelligence community is to gather intelligence — intelligence about capabilities abroad, intelligence about intentions abroad — that will help the policymakers make sound decisions. Not to make them for them, but to provide

them with information upon which they can give the maximum amount of confidence in making their decision.

I think it's my responsibility to say in the councils of which I am a member what I think that intelligence means. But not to shape it or manipulate it but to give it all the integrity that I know how.

I believe that that intelligence must come from a variety of techniques including human intelligence, especially in the area of intentions. If we had better human intelligence in Iran, we might have anticipated what was going on there. Intelligence in the street, rather than in the embassy, that's just a private opinion. And I'm not faulting anyone, any other predecessor, I just simply think human intelligence is very, very important because there is really no other agency in government which can carry out that function. There will from time to time be calls on the agency to engage in certain kinds of covert activity -- activity in furtherance of a legitimate national foreign policy goal that would not succeed if third countries had to face the fact that our government was openly and militarily involved in that effort. Those efforts are controlled by a careful analysis of the ideas and evolution of the plans, a Finding by the President that supports them and authorizes them and oversight by the

1

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Intelligence Committees of the Congress to represent the American people in terms of what we are doing. All of those things, I think are important responsibilities of the Director of Central Intelligence and I believe, too, that it is very important that he exercise his role as the President's principal intelligence advisor.

Now if I may without pressing your time too far, I'd like to say in that respect that I have had a conversation with the President in the company of his chief of staff and principal advisors from the National Security Council.

SENATOR WARNER: That would be Howard Baker and Frank Carlucci?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes, Frank was not there, but

General Powell was there in his place and memorandized

the conversation. In that conversation, I suggested

that I would think it best for me to return to the

traditional role of the Director of Central Intelligence

and not be a member of the President's cabinet. The

President told me that he agreed and had come to the

same conclusion. That I think will help to minimize the

perception that the Director of Central Intelligence is

a political officer of the President's, in the

President's immediate political staffing. But I felt

that it was very important that in making that move, it

be very clear that I would continue to have direct one on one access to the President. Both Mr. Baker and I know Mr. Carlucci from direct conversations with him and his deputy subscribe to that principle, as does the President. And I will exercise that one on one access as well as other opportunities. I also asked for and promptly was given assurances of what I call the awareness principle, that I be made aware of emerging issues and be invited to attend meetings of the cabinet and other inner circle functions in which issues that would depend upon accurate intelligence would come to me at an early enough date to be of assistance in guiding the President to a correct opinion. So if I have access and awareness I do not need, nor want to be involved, in a cabinet level function and I think we're all straight on that and all in agreement on it.

SENATOR WARNER: Judge Webster, I thank you for those responses. I think they are among the more important ones for the Senate to consider as we pass on your nomination. You have my support. Good Luck.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Senator Warner.

Judge Webster, we've kept you far past the time that I indicated we would this morning before breaking.

I think, therefore, it would be more appropriate for the

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Committee to wait to resume until 2:30 this afternoon. So we'll stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 1:22 o'clock p.m., the Committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 o'clock p.m., the same day.)

. 3

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll resume our questioning at this point. We will continue having rounds of questions in the order that we did this morning until the Members of the Committee have had an opportunity to complete the questions which they wish to ask. Judge Webster, I will remind you that you are still under oath from this morning's testimony.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Let me begin the questioning this afternoon. In regard to the question you were asked by Senator Cohen this morning, I believe that he quoted a newspaper article, I believe it was in early December, quoting you as stating that as of that time, you felt there had been no destruction of records in the course of the investigation conducted by the Attorney General.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, because I know these are important questions, I believe I said that nothing had been called to my attention. I didn't have a feeling about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I just wonder on what basis you felt that there had not been a destruction. Was it merely that nothing had been called to your attention?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, that's why I interrupted you because I didn't say I felt that there had not been a destruction; I just said that we hadn't

found any yet.

7.

THE CHAIRMAN: You had not found any evidence of destruction of records. Did you make any attempt on your own to check as this matter began to unfold during that four day period.

Did you make any attempt to discuss the possible destruction of records with anyone or did you endeavor to have the FBI check in any way independently to determine whether records had been destroyed?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Now, are we back -- we're on December 5th --

THE CHAIRMAN: Between November the 21st and November the 25th.

JUDGE WEBSTER: When I met with the Attorney

General following his and the President's announcement
at the White House and I met with -- I was waiting for
them when he returned to his office in the Department of
Justice. We convened a meeting there to discuss the
implications of what had been announced. And during
that discussion, a question of preserving the records
came up. And it was my understanding that the
Department was taking steps to ask the appropriate
officials to preserve their records.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you do anything to assure -- or what did you do yourself with FBI resources to determine

whether or not any records had been destroyed?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The Attorney General stated that he had turned the question of responsible criminal involvement over to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, which was considering what, if any, statutes may have been violated. And so there — at that point — the FBI was not authorized to conduct an investigation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you simply take the word of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice that there had been no destruction of records, or did you endeavor independently to assure that there was no destruction of records?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The Attorney General did not make that representation. We discussed as a group -- and I considered myself a part of that senior management -- what should be done. One of the things that we decided that should be done was that the records should be preserved and the Department undertook to make -- to notify those -- the appropriate officials.

Now, as it happens --

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean, they just simply -- this seems to me to be a very naive approach in all honesty and all candor -- to simply say, here we're dealing with people that have records in their custody that are

suspected of criminal wrongdoing. I assume that in most cases you would simply not notify someone that you suspect of a criminal act; we don't want you to destroy your records now that might implicate you in any wrongdoing.

I mean, are we simply relying upon the good offices of the people under suspicion not to destroy the records?

National Security Council. We do not have an opinion from the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice as to what criminal statutes, if any, form the basis for a criminal investigation as of this conference that I'm discussing and that form of notification is not unlike the forms of notification that the Senate sends out to agencies in the Executive branch not to destroy records.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, now we go back to November 25th when the press conference was held and it became clear that we were into a criminal investigation.

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's the afternoon I'm talking about.

THE CHAIRMAN: The afternoon of November 25th.

On that afternoon, at that point the FBI was asked to step in, I believe.

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, Mr. Chairman, the FBI was not

.

asked to step in until Wednesday morning. The Criminal Division was still considering what criminal laws were implicated by what the Attorney General and his staff

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Wednesday morning was what date?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The 26th.

had developed over the weekend.

THE CHAIRMAN: The 26th?

On the 25th, what action did you take or what assertions did you make in terms of preserving the records?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Only what I have related to you, that there was a discussion in the Attorney General's office about preserving the records and the Attorney General undertook, through the Department, to notify the appropriate heads to preserve the records.

THE CHAIRMAN: On November 26th when the FBI was called in, what actions did you take at that point to assure the preservation of records?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The FBI checked to determine whether or not the NSC records had been secured and were informed that they had been secured the night before, on Tuesday.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who informed you that they had been secured?

SSCI FORM 23

JUDGE WEBSTER: I'm informed that the individual who reported this to us was Mr. Jay Stevens of the President's Counsel's office.

THE CHAIRMAN: The President's Counsel's office informed you that they had been secured?

What action did you take to independently verify whether or not they had been secured other than just taking the word of the White House Counsel who might well have been not an unbiased source in this matter.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, I was in Chicago at that point. But the agents who were involved were investigating, conducting interviews, and I am sure they did whatever was appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: What action have you taken to make sure they did whatever was appropriate? What check have you made of their actions?

We've had this report which was alluded to by the Vice Chairman this morning. It's been in the press that Fawn Hall, among others, have indicated that there were large amounts of records shredded and destroyed during this period of time.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Which period of time, Mr. Chairman? THE CHAIRMAN: Well, from November 21st on.

And, therefore, I'm wondering what independent check you made or what personal attention you gave to

the protection and preservation of those records at the time when it would be somewhat, I think, negligent to simply rely upon the assurances of say, the President's Counsel's office.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well -- that was the first check that was made. I can't answer because I said I was in Chicago. But the -- I received reports from time to time from my officials on the investigative steps that were taking place. And when the Independent Counsel was appointed, he, of course, assumed responsibility on December 19th.

THE CHAIRMAN: On December 19th?

JUDGE WEBSTER: He was appointed on December 19th.

He asked us to continue our investigations until he actually took over.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who took physical custody of those records?

In other words, were they put under lock and key, under guard? Who took physical custody? Do you know? Of those documents in the period -- Say if we start with November 21st, when the Attorney General began his inquiry on through the morning of November 26th when the FBI was officially called in up to the the date in December when the Special Counsel was appointed -- who assumed responsibility for physical control and custody

of the documents in the period from November 21st through the date in December when the Independent Prosecutor was appointed?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I'm informed by Mr. Clarke, who is in direct charge of that investigation who is present here this morning, the Assistant Director, that agents were sent promptly to the National Security Council to verify that they were in fact sealed and to make arrangements to have access to the sealed documents for inspection and investigation.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, an agent, you may feel free to turn to Mr. Clarke, on what date were agents sent to verify that the documents were sealed in a manner in which they could not be tampered with?

MR. CLARKE: On the 26th.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was on the 26th.

Let me go back to the question of your colleagues and associates bringing to you concerns. Senator Cohen asked you this morning about colleagues, I believe the Deputy Director Mr. Revell and others had mentioned to you concerns about the activities of Colonel North.

I want to recall your answers as to what kinds of concerns your colleagues brought to you about Colonel North?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well these concerns which we

discussed at various times had to do with a freewheeling kind of atmosphere. I want to be careful of
what I'm saying about someone who is not charged here.
I think we worried about his influence in the National
Security Council. He was a very gung ho person, a very
tunnel visioned, outgoing — rather result oriented
without what I could only term a broader gauge approach
to the implications of what he was doing.

That may or may not be true. That was the kind of concern that we had -- that these think tanks might turn into action tanks, and that we might not know about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you have any question as to whether or not he was acting within the bounds of instructions or powers or authority given to him by those above him?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I think there was some anxiety on our part to be sure that that was the case, but we were never -- we were never -- I know that Mr. Revell was checking -- we were never tasked that I can remember to do anything so it didn't come into an issue of his authority. But there was just some general concern that something foolhardy might take place without the proper scrutiny by others who might have a more balanced judgment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Roughly, during what period of time

.7

did you and Mr. Revell and perhaps others in the Bureau have discussions among yourselves regarding concern about Colonel North?

JUDGE WEBSTER: It was going on for a long time. I don't want to suggest that we were panicked by it or that we were — we had high anxieties pains. We just regarded him as a different kind of person than we normally associate with the National Security Council and its proper function. And we tried to be a little more watchful about the activities in which he took a role.

THE CHAIRMAN: To whom did you or Mr. Revell express these concerns that you felt over this period of time?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, it was more of a matter of opinion expression rather than asking anybody to do about it. I discussed this with the Attorney General. He was aware — he was aware of Ollie North as the kind of personality that he was and my concern that we stay on top of what was going on in the National Security Council to be sure that things were not getting out of hand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we know that on October 30th, there was this memorandum we have referred to where this person in the Justice Department was quoted as

expressing concern about the possible criminal prosecution of Colonel North. You've said that over a period of time, you, Mr. Revell and perhaps others had discussions among yourselves about concern as to the judgment of Colonel North.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think that's it, in judgment. I don't think any of us questioned his regard for the law and certainly he was a likable kind of person, but he --

THE CHAIRMAN: You had some discussions at least with the Attorney General about it. You had --

JUDGE WEBSTER: In general -- in general terms, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In general terms.

You had the investigation of Southern Air commencing earlier which was suspended on October the 3rd. I presume the investigation was of whether or not appropriate or inappropriate activities were being undertaken to aid the resistance in Nicaragua. I presume that those investigations might have also touched upon concern about Colonel North as well. I'm sure Colonel North's name would have popped up in that he was very much involved in the recruitment and raising of funds for these various operations.

My question is did you ever express this concern to the President as to whether or not the President was

fully aware of activities of Colonel North?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I did not. I didn't have any solid information in that area at all that would have warranted my expressing that kind of opinion even to the Attorney General.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Cohen?

SENATOR COHEN: Mr. Chairman, the question about the memo should not be seen as raising exaggerated concerns on the part of the Committee, Judge Webster. Part of the difficulty is, as Senator Moynihan pointed out earlier, there have been several occasions in the past several years, including the mining of the harbors in Nicaragua and several other cases in which the Committee was not notified of certain items, and then we had a Deputy Secretary of State Department come up and publicly acknowledge that he thought he had successfully circumvented the nature of this specific question asked.

And I think the question that was posed to you was perhaps inartfully asked. I don't know why, in question number three, that we said on what date did you learn, either directly or indirectly, from sources other than public media. I don't why we excluded the public media, but we did. And, for that reason, you concluded that it was not necessary to inform the Committee about this memo.

24.

It really comes down to how specific do we have to be? Do we always have to ask the right question or be precluded from getting at least the spirit of the answer we are looking for. I think that is the context in which many of the questions are now being asked of you. Had it not been for the Special Prosecutor — Independent Counsel — we would not have known about this and we didn't learn about it until last evening. And so it raises an issue as to how specific we have to be in the future in terms of getting information.

With respect to that --

JUDGE WEBSTER: May I say something about that,
Senator? I certainly agree with what you are saying.
As I pointed out in my statement to you that the public source thing was only part of the equation. The other equation was that there was just simply nothing in that memorandum that pointed towards the illegal activities of U.S. government officials, which is what the question asked for. And I don't think any of us felt that it was included in that equation. And not that we were trying to hide anything from you. I didn't even remember that memorandum.

SENATOR COHEN: For the benefit of the press who has been inquiring -- it has nothing to do with Iran.

Colonel North himself is not mentioned in the memo. But

it does, according to your answer, include that a Justice Department official, based on her reading of newspaper articles concluded that Colonel North might be involved in a future criminal probe by a Special Prosecutor concerning U.S. activities in Central America.

So, there was at least some concern at a certain level that he might be prosecuted at some future time.

I guess the question I have is that if, in fact, you were worried about the influence of Colonel North within NSC as you have just stated to Senator Boren, if in fact you were concerned about NSC being involved in a covert operation as far as actually carrying out the covert operation, why weren't you also concerned about the possible destruction of records once the matter started to come to public light and there was going to be an investigation?

In other words, if you have a man who, according to one official, may be subject to criminal prosecution sometime in the future, you have concerns about an individual who is gung ho and perhaps a bit too aggressive or whatever, are generally concerned about his activities in terms of judgment, and then a matter of this magnitude erupts suddenly — now got a major investigation or inquiry going — undergoing the

process, why wouldn't you also have a concern about what would be taking place over that week -- in that four or five day period -- about who's in charge of the NSC?

What's happening in that office? I didn't detect that in your response.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, if you're asking me to inquire into my state of mind, which I think you are, you have to get rid of that memorandum that supplied some information about — that had had attached to it a note that the government official — Bob, maybe that ought to be shown to — I just had no recollection — that was not in my mind. It was — and not considered to be important. I really still don't consider it to be important.

Be it the substance of the memorandum or the comment of the United States Attorney. So what I had, I think it --

SENATOR COHEN: Does it adopt any importance in your mind now after the fact, looking back saying that here's a man who may be under possible indictment by a Special Prosecutor for perhaps obstruction of justice?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, because the Department official was just observing what was in the newspaper. With no extra information at all on that subject. But I think your question is a legitimate one about preservation of

records.

I was not -- I was frankly not concerned over the weekend, because at that time, I did not believe that there was concern about a criminal violation touching on the Iranian arms shipment. I had been informed that there was a Finding, that it had been reviewed by the Attorney General, and that the action was lawful. I had no reason to believe that either the National Security Advisor or Colonel North had any reason to conceal information about a lawful activity.

If that was naivete, I confess to it. But sometimes in twenty-twenty hindsight, things seem a lot clearer than they did at the time. That's the way it was. That was the way we were looking.

When we became aware of the new issue -- that is the diversion of funds to the Contras -- it may be that I and indeed the other members of the senior management of the Department should have been more aggressive in more rapidly freezing information. I believe, and I can't comment on this without getting into the Independent Counsel's business, that any damage that was done was done prior to that Tuesday afternoon meeting. And, as I said, the FBI, who was given jurisdiction, moved in promptly on its own to make sure those areas were taken care of.

Now, you can say yes we should have done it a day earlier. And I won't quarrel with that. I'm certainly willing to be second-guessed, and I try to second guess myself on that. But I can only tell you the way it was and how it appeared to me.

SENATOR COHEN: On Southern Air Transport, what was the nature of the FBI's investigation into Southern Air Transport that began in late October after a plane was shot down in Nicaragua?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The plane was shot down in mid-October or early October. It did not involve -- it was not a Southern Air airplane. But reports circulated quickly in the newspapers that the plane that had started in El Salvador and it landed -- it crashed in Nicaragua, had been maintained in some way at the Florida facility of Southern Air Transport. And so we opened a preliminary inquiry --

SENATOR COHEN: What was the nature of the inquiry?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, the nature of the inquiry was
to ask for records which were not readily destructible.

That is records from official agencies about the tail
number, registration --

SENATOR COHEN: What was the purpose of it -- to find whether there was a violation on Congressional ban on assistance to Nicaragua? What was its purpose?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think it was a Neutrality Act predicate, that is, whether or not we were furnishing arms or anything of that kind that was specifically banned by statute, and to a neutral nation — I mean to enemies of a nation with whom we are not at war. And we were looking to see if there was a connection. We wanted some records. We had an informant. We had interviewed the informant. All that we needed to do at that point was to have a second interview with the informant.

SENATOR COHEN: Now, when you were contacted by the Attorney General's office -- the Attorney General or Oliver North had contacted your office?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Trott, the Associate Attorney General, called me.

SENATOR COHEN: On behalf of the Attorney General?

JUDGE WEBSTER: On behalf of the Attorney General.

SENATOR COHEN: Okay. And he said that he would ask that you would delay for ten days so that you wouldn't jeopardize the sensitive negotiations?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I want to emphasize that he said if we would suspend for ten days any non-urgent investigative business.

SENATOR COHEN: Were there any urgent aspects to your investigative --

SSCI FORM 23

JUDGE WEBSTER: Not that I am aware of. I asked Mr. Clarke that specific question, and he said absolutely not.

SENATOR COHEN: Were you curious as to how your investigation into the relationship between Southern Air Transport and the plane that was down in Nicaragua could somehow jeopardize these delicate negotiations?

Weren't you curious to say well how in the world is that possible?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, Senator Cohen. I was not. I was not as curious as you might think because in early October, Colonel North had called -- after the crash -- Colonel North had called Mr. Revell, who was then at a meeting in Nashville. I had attended the same meeting but had left the city. And he called to let him know that the same place -- he was aware that we were investigating something at Southern Air and that he wanted us to know that that was the airplane company that had helped them on the other operation, I think was the way he described it. Which he -- over in the other place and --

SENATOR COHEN: Assuming that to be the case, that this airline was operating in Iran and in Central America, again, wouldn't you be curious as to why your investigation as to its operations in Central America

would somehow jeopardize the release of hostages over in Iran?

I mean I don't understand the connection.

JUDGE WEBSTER: The question that the -- the way the Attorney General put it through Mr. Trott was that they were trying to preserve a safe environment for hostage negotiations that were going on at that time. And the concern was that any public awareness of Southern Air's involvement in the Iran would -- now this is not coming from the Attorney General, this is what I'm deriving from my conversation with Mr. Revell -- might expose the hostage negotiations.

SENATOR COHEN: But at that point your investigation was confined really to seeing what the relationship was of Southern Air Transport to Nicaragua? It had nothing to do with Iran?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's right.

SENATOR COHEN: I guess the question is how do you make the leap to get into Iran that the Iranians somehow might be upset to see that the FBI was investigating the nature of Mr. Husenfus's activities in Central America that somehow might jeopardize the negotiations currently underway in Iran?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, there was great sensitivity over there as evidenced by the fact that the Congress

:

was not -- that you were not told of what was going on about having any information about what was going on or who was supporting that activity get out in the public domain in any way.

SENATOR COHEN: So that it really was not a question of directly jeopardizing the negotiations, but rather that if Congress got any wind of your investigation into Southern Air, we might start inquiring further, and that might unravel the negotiations.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I didn't tie Congress into it. I tried to use that as an illustration that -- for the same reason --

SENATOR COHEN: That's a pretty good illustration.

I mean I don't disagree with what you've said. That

probably was the rationale, wasn't it?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I didn't ask what the rationale was. It did not seem unreasonable to me since the -- Mr. Clarke said there was no problem with that investigation, that it was not that kind of an urgent investigation and it could wait for ten days.

When you are talking about very sensitive hostage negotiations, we were all aware that the efforts were being made to get the hostages out. That there is a lot of sensitivity at that time and no one wants to rock the

 boat. And, as long as it did not interfere with an ongoing investigation, I had no problems with it.

SENATOR COHEN: Time has expired. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Metzenbaum was not able to ask his questions this morning so I'm going to turn to him next.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know, I had a bill on the Floor and was not able to be here at that time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correct.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: Judge Webster, I'm happy to see you again and welcome you.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: I'm concerned, Judge Webster, about the question of maybe who is watching the chicken coop and whether the fox is in the coop. I'm concerned about instances when the press reports a case of possible wrongdoing by an Administration official, such as in the Wedtech case, involving Mr. Nofziger and Mr. Wallach and now, perhaps, Mr. Meese. The question is what does the FBI do? In the Wedtech case, we have in Mr. Wallach a man who prides himself on his close relationship, in fact says that he had been approached by Wedtech, quote, "because of my notoriety as a good friend of Ed Meese," unquote.

And in that case, the Attorney General causes to be set up at their instance a meeting in the White House — and thereafter Wedtech gets a 32 million dollar no-bid military contract. The Army had been opposed to it. The Army dropped its objections. Now we know about Mr. Nofziger's involvement and we know about the involvement of another individual — Jenkins. But Mr. Wallach comes in from out of nowhere and is hired by this company because he is very close to Mr. Meese.

My question is what does the FBI do when they read stories of this kind? What is your role as Director? There may or may not have been law violations here, but the person involved may be the Attorney General of the United States. And he's the one who calls for the appointment of an Independent Counsel. What are you doing or what do you intend to do with reference to this kind of matter?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think that the procedure,
Senator Metzenbaum, is pretty well set out in the ethics
in government -- rather the Independent Counsel statute
which sets out that we will promptly consult with the
officials in the Department of Justice -- not the
Attorney General, but the people in the public integrity
section, the career people -- and advise them of any
allegations or information that has come to our

attention. Then under the statute there is a period of time during which we attempt through means other than grand jury process to obtain any additional information that will help the Attorney General decide whether or not to appoint an Independent Counsel. He must make a finding to the court designated for the appointment of Independent Counsel within a stated period of time. While I don't have all those procedures firmly in my head, it is a self-driving procedure under the statute.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: But you missed my point. He may be the one who ought to be investigated. There may have to be a special Independent Counsel appointed in connection with his activities. I don't know that, but I think the people of this country are entitled to have a satisfactory answer. And the only one who can make the investigation and to go forward with the matter is your arm of government. And my question to you is not alone with revolving around Mr. Wallach and Wedtech. We know that in the Whittlesley case —

JUDGE WEBSTER: Which case, sir?

SENATOR METZENBAUM: Whittlesley. Ambassador Whittlesey. W-H-I-T-T-L-E-S-L-E-Y, where the Attorney General was involved, where he decided not to -- there was no need of Independent Counsel. We also know that in the Schmults case there was an Independent Counsel in

connection with one other person in that matter.

SENATOR NUNN: Mr. Olsen.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: In that case that there was the withholding from the Congress in an executive privilege dispute, of certain papers that were in the EPA. And Deputy Attorney General Schmults reportedly took it upon himself to withhold from Congress hundreds of pages of handwritten notes without telling the Committee he was doing that, and finally Attorney General Meese was forced to ask for an Independent Counsel. But he has refused to let that Counsel investigate Mr. Schmults or Miss Dinkins.

Now as a matter of fact, the Independent Counsel even went to court asking for the right to investigate Mr. Schmults. Mr. Schmults is also a friend of Mr. Meese's. Miss Whittlesley is a friend of Mr. Meese's.

There is also another matter. We know of Mr.

Meese's involvement. As we read in the paper yesterday,

Meese learned about sale of arms — and a probe that was

being done having to do with arms sales— to the

Contras. And Mr. Meese sticks his nose into a pending

investigation that is being conducted by the Justice

Department. And Mr. Meese is asked why he is sticking

his nose in. He says I wanted to see if he had such an

investigation going on because I had seen it in the

SSCI FORM 23

1

3

6

. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

newspaper.

Well, all of these things involved special interests of Mr. Meese. And my question is, how can the American people rely upon the investigative arm of the United States Government to do something, to find out whether there is and has indeed been a law violation, if everything that you do stops with the man who himself may be the investigatee?

JUDGE WEBSTER: There have been a lot of problems with the statute over the last several years. And interpreting all the way to the questions going to the constitutionality of the statute. The statute, in some respects, is confining on the investigative arm because if a protected person, rather not a protected person -excuse me -- a covered person, that is a person who is subject to the provisions of the Independent Counsel act, is under investigation, then we must necessarily confine the scope of our investigation in order not to step on the shoes of the Independent Counsel if one is These all follow a statutory scheme and if there is a problem with the Act of the kind you suggest, Senator, then I think the Congress ought to look at the Act and see if it needs improvement --

SENATOR METZENBAUM: But I don't think that's the end of it. I don't think it's enough to say that we

ought to look at the Act to change it.

The question I'm really asking you is, has the FBI in the past, or do they intend to, investigate these four separate issues that have to do with the Attorney General himself and his conduct? And if you don't investigate them, nobody will investigate them. If you investigate them and then you say to the Attorney General, we believe an Independent Counsel ought to be appointed to investigate the Attorney General, that would be one thing. Or you could say, we believe that there is enough involved in this matter to submit it to a grand jury without going through the Independent Counsel.

But absent that, here you have four separate instances, and I think I can dig up another four without too much difficulty, regarding the Attorney General's conduct itself, and there is no action — and even one case where the Independent Counsel, is saying I want to investigate. And the Attorney General is standing there protecting his friend.

Wallach was his friend. Schmults was his friend. Whittlesley was his friend. And in the Contra arms sale, there was a question of friendship, but a question of ostensibly attempting to advance Administration policy.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I believe the courts have passed some judgment on what an Independent Counsel can do and what the scope of the Independent Counsel's authority is when it comes to a question of appointing or not appointing an Independent Counsel. The Attorney General has to give his report to the Congress. I would expect that an Attorney General would always consider whether or not the matter requires his recusal. And I am sure that that has been done, but I really don't know how to answer your question. We will investigate just as vigorously as possible any matter within our jurisdiction. If it happens to come within the provisions of the Independent Counsel statute, then we are required to coordinate our work through the career department officials who will determine the timing and the scope of our investigation.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: Will you investigate the Wedtech matter and the Attorney General's personal involvement in that matter?

JUDGE WEBSTER: It's my understanding that we did participate in the preliminary inquiry.

We are, and that is a pending investigation, I'm just not at liberty to comment on what we are doing.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: I'm sorry.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I say, there has been and there is

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a pending investigation. I'm just not at liberty to comment on the details of it because it is a pending investigation.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: I think that this goes to the integrity of the process, because it is the Attorney General who is involved — to the extent that he is involved, and I don't know whether he violated any laws or not, but I think the American people are entitled to know. And I would hope that will there be some report or some indication at the conclusion of your investigation.

JUDGE WEBSTER: There will be a report which will go to the court and whether it's signed by the Attorney General, or, if he should recuse himself by the person who stands in his shoes, I'm not in a position to say at this time. But it is a report that is required of the senior official in the department acting at that time in that capacity.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: Director Webster, my time has expired and I'm not sure whether I will be able to have another round of questioning, but either today or tomorrow I do want to get into the entire Varelli matter.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Certainly.

SENATOR METZENBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Metzenbaum.

Senator Murkowski, I know you were otherwise tied up this morning. You may wish us to go on to Senator Specter before we come back to you. Are you prepared to ask your questions now, or would you like to defer to Senator Specter?

SENATOR MURKOWSKI: No, I think I'll wait a little further. I think there will be time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Specter?

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Judge Webster, since this morning's round of questioning, I have had an opportunity to review the memorandum of October 30th, 1986, that you had addressed as an addendum in your opening remarks. And there are two portions of this memorandum which seems important to me. One portion of the memorandum which contains a notation that Lieutenant Colonel North may soon be involved in a criminal probe concerning United States activities in Central America by a special prosecutor. And a second notation in the memorandum that it would not be possible to advise other persons in the NSC -- National Security Council -- and be assured that the information would not be made available to Lieutenant Colonel North.

1 2

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

Your initials appear on the face of the memo. My question to you is are those two matters of sufficient importance that had you read this memo you would have recollected?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I have already told you, Senator, that I did not in fact recollect it. And those are my initials, so I did read it.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, I ask you specifically, Judge Webster, in the context of those two comments; I had not asked you about those comments before because I'd only had a summary memo from Intelligence Committee staff. Now I have seen the memo itself. I focus on the language about Lieutenant Colonel North and that he may soon be involved in a criminal probe concerning U.S. activities in Central America by a Special Prosecutor. And I come back to the questions which were asked by Senator Boren earlier about your taking this up with higher officials in the Executive branch and you testified that you had with Attorney General Meese, in a general way, you used expressions that North was gung ho and had tunnel vision. That's substantially different from the statement in a FBI memo on an evaluation that he might be involved in a criminal prosecution.

And my question is -- and I don't know if it's useful to pursue it if you don't remember having read

this -- but isn't this the kind of serious matter relating to somebody in the White House, and the National Security Council's key position where the Director of the FBI ought to take that up with the Attorney General or even the President.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I don't think so. But you can fault my judgment on it. It was an informational memorandum. It was a speculative comment by a Department official, not an official advice. It was speculative comment. It was not taken seriously by anyone else who was actually working those investigations. I received no further communications from my own people about it. And so I simply have to put it in the context at the time. And it probably explains why I don't remember it. I'm sure I read it, but I didn't remember it because there are a lot of things that I have read that I don't now remember that are just informational.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, Judge Webster, I don't know that it is speculative. And on the face of this memo, I candidly don't agree with that.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, the official says it was speculative. And the official says that it was based upon newspaper reports exclusively.

We've talked to the official about it.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, this memo says that the information would be redundant with that publicly available. But the memo itself does not say that the information is based on newspaper sources.

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, the information contained in the main memorandum which was not about Lieutenant Colonel North was redundant.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, what is your basis for saying that it was speculative that Lieutenant Colonel North might be the subject of criminal investigation involving a Special Prosecutor?

JUDGE WEBSTER: " Might" or "may" is speculative.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, if it is speculative, is it not serious? Is it not something to be pursued with substantial concern?

JUDGE WEBSTER: If there is an investigation in fact, Senator Specter, I hope it would come to me by some other means than by an officer not involved in that speculating about the newspapers. That was just informational. That is the way it must have been taken by me. But as I have testified, I regret that I have to tell you I don't remember that memorandum.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well the memo doesn't say that it's either speculative or based upon newspapers. You may conclude that it's speculative. I don't read it

that way. My judgment is that if their reading is not that, but even if it were, it's pretty serious.

If you add to it, Judge Webster, that the conclusion is reached not to advise other purposes in the NSC because there is no assurance that the information would not be made available to Lieutenant Colonel North, isn't that a serious matter? If you have information which comes to the FBI and that matter is such that it ought to be referred to the NSC, pretty important material, and you can't do so because North will see it, isn't that a serious matter?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I won't argue with you, Senator.

If you want to call it a serious matter and say that I was negligent in failing to view it as a serious matter,

I'll accept your verdict on that.

But if you were to ask the person who made that report, that person would tell you it was based entirely on newspaper reading.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, I don't have a judgment on it, Judge Webster. I'm just asking questions. I'm trying to figure out -- I'm trying to figure out your role in it. But it seems to me that if the FBI is not going to pass information on to the National Security Council because North may have access to it and if North even speculatively may be the subject of a criminal

probe by a Special Prosecutor, that's serious business.

And that when the FBI Director reads it, he ought to note it. And he ought to tell the Attorney General about it. And may be he ought to tell the President about it.

This language just can't be blown away. And now we have, a few months later, North, under investigation by a Special Prosecutor. And we have North being involved in calling up the FBI and saying this is the same outfit which is taking care of our business in Iran. This is the same man who is handling a great many matters. This is a man who you say is flawed with tunnel vision, he's gung ho, that he's result oriented, that he has no broad gauged concern.

Now those aren't the characterizations of a criminal. But those are red flags. Those are danger signals.

Well, I have asked the questions and I think I've gotten your answers.

Let me come on to the subject of the information you had about the sale of arms to Iran where you had been informed, as you said, about August 6th of 1986, that there was a sale of arms to Iran and you had taken it up with the Attorney General. And I had touched on this briefly in the opening round of questions and

really didn't get finished with it. And had asked you in the albeit brief conversation which you had with Attorney General Meese on November 21st, 1986, what was said, if anything, specifically about the sale of arms to Iran?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I believe my response, Senator Specter, was that I was the one who outlined what I knew, or what I, rather, what I had been told and asked him whether that was correct.

SENATOR SPECTER: Which conversation are you talking about?

JUDGE WEBSTER: We're talking about the only one we had about this thing, November 21, on Friday.

SENATOR SPECTER: And what did you say specifically to Attorney General Meese, if anything, about the sale of arms to Iran?

JUDGE WEBSTER: All right, it went something like this, as best I can recall. It was following a luncheon or breakfast meeting in his dining room. I followed him into his office and I said that I had been advised by Buck Revell that at an OSG meeting, Oliver North had said that there was a — that they were working on a new Iranian initiative which involved some backwater or back channel negotiations to reopen relations with certain parts of the Iranian people, that it might involve a

SSCI FORM 23

shipment of -- or would involve a shipment of arms and possibly some hostage negotiation -- some assistance with the hostages, that I understood that there had been a Presidential Finding supporting this and that he had seen it and approved it. And I just wanted to be sure that he had seen and that he had approved it. That's the substance of the conversation.

SENATOR SPECTER: That's November 21st, 1986?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's correct.

SENATOR SPECTER: And at what point did Mr. Meese say to you that he was going to conduct some inquiry and where you agreed to?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I beg your pardon. I've been focusing on the wrong date. This information came to me

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, I thought you might have.

That's why I came back to August --

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes, I'm sorry. I apologize for that that.

Everything that I said is correct, but it occurred shortly after August 5th, which was the day that I received the information from Mr. Revell. I beg your pardon.

SENATOR SPECTER: All right. So on that day there had been--

. 1 2

3

May I have about three minutes, Mr. Chairman, until

I can come back to another round?

THE CHAIRMAN: Please go ahead and complete your

line of thought.

SENATOR SPECTER: All right, thank you very much,

Mr. Chairman.

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

So on August the 5th you had the conversation with Attorney General Meese about the backchannel negotiations and the shipment of arms to Iran and some hostages being involved.

Now, what conversation did you have with Mr. Meese on November 21st, 1986?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes, that was a -- following some other reason for my being there, I think we were -- we had been working on a National -- on our department resources board meeting as I best recall. I'm not certain. The Attorney General mentioned to me as I was getting ready to leave -- I think it probably was prompted by some comment of mine about the confusion of statements in the press about what was going on, what happened in Iran -- that the President had asked him to determine the facts. And that he was going over and was going to talk to the various people involved and was going to try to get the facts straight. Get them accurate.

SENATOR SPECTER: Was it at that point that you made an offer of personnel?

JUDGE WEBSTER: At that point, I said, "Can we be of any help?"

SENATOR SPECTER: And he said what?

JUDGE WEBSTER: As best I can recall, he said, "No I don't think so. I don't think there's any need for it, there's nothing criminal about this that I can see, do you?" And I said, "Well no, not on the basis of what I know now.

And we agreed. And that was the end of the conversation.

MY mind, Judge Webster, was the one which I had started to pursue with you this morning. And that was that in the context of the conversation you had shortly after August 5th, 1986, about the backchannel negotiations and the hostages, and the sale of arms to Iran, and the federal laws, the Export Administration Act which bars exports of goods to nations which support terrorism and Iran had been so classified in the Export Arms Control Act which regulates transfers of munitions and requires Congressional approval. The President can't handle it on his own Finding. You have to have Congressional notification and be overruled. In the totality of that

context, why did you not consider that there might be some criminality involved or allegation of criminality or possibility of it?

If I can supplement it as the final comment I have, you said earlier, Judge Webster, that when Senator Cohen asked you what you would have done differently and then he said what would you have done. You responded that you are not an expert investigator and I can understand that. You're the Administrator of the FBI. The Attorney General is not an investigator either. When you start to ask questions, you have to give Miranda warnings, and you have custodial interrogations, you have investigative techniques, preservation of documents, sealings, a tremendous number of very complex matters people only know when they're in it day in and day out.

Where you had the information about the sale of arms, why was there not a danger signal at all that this was something that the FBI really ought to be involved in?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I didn't see any danger signals at the time. On the basis of the facts as I knew them, my confidence that the Attorney General had reviewed the legal predicate for the actions that were being taken over there. He wasn't going over there to find out if a

crime had been committed. He was going over to find out exactly what had happened. Who had authorized this. Who had authorized that. He was going to talk to the people. They were all making statements that it seemed at times to be inconsistent. And inaccurate.

Certainly, I would not have felt that it was necessary to take the FBI in there on the basis of a customs management export-import control violation. My assumptions were that if the Attorney General was a part of the National Security Council, had reviewed the Findings, had been brought into it, given an opportunity to consider the legal aspects of what was taking place over there, that that was what was important.

I just wanted to be sure they weren't off running around without legal advice.

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you very much, Judge Webster. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hecht?

SENATOR HECHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's been a hot afternoon, and before we get on with the security questions, I'll go back to the x rated questions we were on before, about brothel owner Joe Conforti and the Judge Claiborne case and your handling of agents in the FBI.

Brothel owner Joe Conforti was offered millions in

SSCI FORM 23

1 · 2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

tax breaks to testify against Judge Clairborne. Was that your call, Judge?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That was not my call and I don't believe it to be true. But it was not my call.

SENATOR HECHT: That was not your call and you do not believe it to be true?

JUDGE WEBSTER: And I am unaware of it today.

SENATOR HECHT: What do you know about allegations that Mr. Yablonski directed --

JUDGE WEBSTER: Let me, if I may, correct the record a little.

SENATOR HECHT: Yes.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think there might have been some suggestions of that kind of a basis for a plea bargain. But it was not my call.

SENATOR HECHT: I will have to research that out.

And I will give you a prepared question on that.

My recollection at the time was in the newspaper that he was given tax breaks.

JUDGE WEBSTER: He may very well have been. I was listening to the amounts you were talking about and I don't really know that to be true but it may be part of the plea agreement. But it was not my call.

SENATOR HECHT: It was not your call. That's the main point. Okay.

1 2 3

7

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

What do you know about allegations that Mr. Yablonski directed a break-in at Judge Claiborne's home? Did the FBI or Justice Department ever investigate those allegations?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I believe those allegations were investigated as part of an overall Office of Professional Responsibility investigation following various allegations of that kind that were made. We did not authorize such a break-in. I do not, in fact, know that such a break-in occurred.

SENATOR HECHT: What resulted from the investigation of allegations Yablonski's wife was intimidating local casinos into buying fresh shrimp from a company she was associated with?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That investigation was -- there was an investigation of that and it was concluded that it was unfounded.

SENATOR HECHT: Was it not true though that Mr. Yablonski's wife was in that business and did sell shrimp to the hotels?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes, indeed. It was true. that's why we conducted the investigation.

SENATOR HECHT: But there was no implication that she was using her husband's influence to do -- to get this contract?

17.

 JUDGE WEBSTER: That was the result of the investigation, Senator.

SENATOR HECHT: Were you aware that while Joseph Yablonski was heading the Las Vegas field office, he kept a forty thousand dollar bank error in his favor until the bank found the mistake on its own three years later, after the FBI official had left office?

Were you aware of that?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I was aware of it after he had left office. I became aware of it after the matter surfaced, but he was already retired at that time.

There was an investigation conducted. And, again, no action was deemed indicated by the Department of Justice.

SENATOR HECHT: Do you condone any of your FBI field agents or future CIA agents engaging in these types of activities?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Which types, Senator?

SENATOR HECHT: Keeping quiet of a forty thousand dollar bank error.

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I don't condone that.

His explanation was he was not aware of it, that his wife was entirely in charge of the finances. If he had knowingly kept it secret, I would not have condoned it.

SENATOR HECHT: If that was by any other citizen, would he have been prosecuted for that?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I don't know the answer to that.

That's a prosecutor's discretion, and I can't answer the question. It would depend on the intent.

SENATOR HECHT: In October 1982, the head of the Las Vegas FBI Office, Joseph Yablonski, apparently attempted to derail Brian McKay's bid for Attorney General. According to news media accounts, Mr. Yablonski solicited the help of an intelligence investigator at Nellis Air Force Base in an apparent attempt to dig up the reported inflammatory information.

He also had someone check McKay's military central files in St. Louis. I should like to point out that no derogatory information was found and Brian McKay won the election.

Judge Webster, would Mr. Yablonski activities not constitute a violation of the Hatch Act which bars federal officials from interfering in political races?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That matter was investigated by our Office of Professional Responsibility. It was not found that he was engaging in political activities. His explanation was that he wanted to know more about Mr. McKay who was about to come in to see him during the election.

Since there was no evidence that he was engaging in political activities, that matter stood as I have described it. Mr. Yablonski was, however, disciplined by me for what I consider to be extremely bad judgment in utilizing the files of another agency to inquire about Mr. McKay for a reason that I did not consider adequate or sufficient.

SENATOR HECHT: So you would classify this as bad judgment, not any type of a crime?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's correct.

SENATOR HECHT: Were you aware of other prominent Nevadans who were targeted for investigation by the FBI?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Again, I would like to say that ——
it would be very sensitive to use that word targeting
because we target programs. We target organized crime.
We target scheme scams. We should not be targeting
individuals.

There were at various times individuals under investigation in Las Vegas as there are all over the United States. But they are based upon something we believe they've done and not because we have some interest in getting something on them.

SENATOR HECHT: There were newspaper reports, and I just use the term newspaper reports, that certain heads -- pictures were on Mr. Yablonski's walls and he would

SSCI FORM 23

1 2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13.

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

throw darts at them and -- you know anything about anything like that?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I really don't.

SENATOR HECHT: In your opinion, why has the Las Vegas Sun been on such a vendetta -- and I'll just show you a couple of headlines. " Hecht to Grill Webster on Yablonski Vendetta," " Will Hecht Give Webster Indigestion?" And one thing after another like this for the last two years.

Why, in your opinion does the Las Vegas Sun take this on in such a manner?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I don't want to impugn the motives of its editor. He was deeply involved in the Conforti -- rather the Claiborne investigation. He had strong views about it. He even tried to arrange a meeting with a Senator at the White House to protest the investigation.

Things get pretty heated out in Las Vegas as you know, Senator. And it took a pretty strong SAC to stand up to that.

So I'm not at all surprised that the feuding continued as it did.

SENATOR HECHT: SAC? Give us the --

JUDGE WEBSTER: Special Agent in Charge.

SENATOR HECHT: I see.

So you have nothing in your mind that would have 1 2 triggered this? 3 JUDGE WEBSTER: Well I have something in my mind, 4 but I don't think I ought to say it. 5 (General Laughter.) 6 SENATOR HECHT: Well, why not? SENATOR COHEN: And that's why he's a judge and 7 8 you're a Senator. 9 (General laughter.) 10 SENATOR HECHT: I nearly had him talking. Now shut 11 up. 12 (General Laughter.) SENATOR HECHT: Would you care to proceed on that 13 14 or would you not? JUDGE WEBSTER: I'd really rather not. 15 you insist. But I'd really rather not. 16 SENATOR HECHT: Well, if it has any bearing on this 17 hearing I would ask you to. If you don't think it does .18 19 have any bearing, I cannot force you to. JUDGE WEBSTER: I don't think it does, Senator. 20 Newspaper people form opinions, particularly if they own 21 22 the newspaper. And it's -- and you can have your

SENATOR HECHT: Thank you.

23

24

25

article on the front page. I really believe the editor

believes what he is writing, but he is out of line.

You have mentioned that Mr. Yablonski was guilty of bad judgment numerous times. However, when he retired, you have him a glowing recommendation. Is that not correct?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I don't remember a glowing recommendation. I remember writing him a letter of appreciation for all that he had done for the Bureau.

SENATOR HECHT: I got one minute left and let me ask you a question. I'll lead into the intelligence area:

You chair the Government's highest level of counterintelligence coordination group, and you are a member of the Government's key defensive security planning coordinating group. You were a respected jurist. Based on your perspective from all three of these areas, what is your analysis of our ability to build an effective defensive security system? Is there something wrong in government management or there something inherent in our national political philosophies and way of life which makes it impossible for us to prevent these previous losses? Does our tendency in the Congress to politicize these matters have a bad impact?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I believe that we can develop within the Intelligence Community a better system of

what we call countermeasures. That is not counterintelligence, we can do better there too, but countermeasures are systems for protecting our national secrets which exist within the Community itself and within those public contractors with whom -- private contractors with whom the government must share its secrets.

That is only half the equation. The other half of the equation has to do with how we in government publicly act about such things as leaking. Official leaking is bound to reduce the level of concern about private leaking and create a numbness among other government employees about the importance of protecting classified information.

So it starts at the top, in my opinion, if we are going to ever change an attitude about protecting secrets in government.

SENATOR HECHT: I thank you very much. Mr.

Chairman, will we have a chance at another time to
question Judge Webster on classified matters?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes we will. We will definitely if there are Members that have classified items -- and I'll be happy to consult with you about that -- schedule a time to do that. I anticipate that we will continue public hearings as well tomorrow. We might conclude our

SSCI FORM 23

public hearing tomorrow afternoon with a closed session at that time if there are any classified matters.

SENATOR HECHT: I will have some of those questions for you in a classified context. Thank you very much, Judge Webster.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask, Judge Webster, what you would do if you were faced with a situation — a hypothetical situation in which your own values were violated either in terms of the covert action that was undertaken or in terms of failure to notify Congress.

Looking back at the concrete situation, our most recent experience, a very damaging situation that developed with the Iranian arms transfer and the failure to notify Congress for a period of some ten or eleven months.

If you had been the Director of the Central
Intelligence Agency at the time that the Finding was
issued by the President for January, bearing in mind
consent to notify Congress was not given for several
months, what would you have done?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would have to ask the Chairman to understand that I am not possessed of all of the facts.

I only know --

THE CHAIRMAN: Just knowing what you have read in the newspaper.

JUDGE WEBSTER: And in the Tower Commission Report.

THE CHAIRMAN: What would you have done?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would have insisted on revisiting the decision not to tell the Congress on a regular and frequent basis. And at the first opportunity when I felt that those reasons that were important to the President at the time that he made the original order were no longer as important as the need to preserve the trust and confidence I would be coming down as hard as I knew how to get the President to change his mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well in this specific situation, of course, the President did not give authority for notification. In fact, we were finally notified through a newspaper in Beirut.

What would you have done?

Would you have remained as Director of Central
Intelligence Agency given this concrete situation? We
know exactly what occurred, we know from the Tower
Commission, from this Committee's report and from press
accounts. If you had been the Director of Central
Intelligence Agency, would you have continued to serve
in the Administration given the fact that approval to
notify Congress of this operation was not given?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think, first, and I don't want to evade your question because I'm trying to really be sure

that I know the answer to it what in my own mind what I would do. I would have been arguing very strongly that the use of Iranian nationals to assist in the release of American hostages in Beirut in exchange for arms was an ill-advised policy contrary to our stated public policy and one which it was very important that Congress understood and supported and if it did not understand and support it, there was very little chance that it would ever be so viewed by the American people as, as the President said, making sense when it got on the front pages of the newspaper.

It's a little difficult because there was an important ongoing initiative which many people think had some promise. Although others don't. And that is to try to find a way to restore relationships with a strategically important country when its hostile leader should leave the scene which seems to be not in the too far distant future.

That is a very sensitive type of thing. Any kind of backchannel negotiation is very, very sensitive.

SENATOR COHEN: We understand Khomeini's grandmother is still alive. I don't know what you've based that on?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I haven't been in that situation. I explained earlier this morning, I've never

SSCI FORM 23

seen a Finding until I saw the ones in this case. So I'm not sure exactly how much of that was explored.

THE CHAIRMAN: But again, surely having just sat back, not even as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but just an American citizen and now you're reading the newspaper accounts. You would have some feeling about now what would I have done if I'd been sitting there as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and I had argued against this policy and I'd argued in favor of notifying Congress and I'd been overruled month after month after month. Now surely most of us can sit back and many of us perhaps are arm chair quarterbacked too often. Most of us can sit back and say if I were there I would have done such and such.

Now, if you had been there, what would you have done?

Would you have remained a part of the

Administration -- you talked this morning hypothetically
about well if I were confronted with the situation where
I felt it violated my standards or was just going too
far, I would have to leave. Or I would have to get out.
Or, I've forgotten the exact words, but you in essence
meant I would have to resign.

This isn't a hypothetical. It happened. If

William H. Webster, if we confirm you to this post. If you had been sitting there as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, during that period of time, what would you have done?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I must tell you in all candor, I would be asking -- one of the questions I'd be asking is could this particular Committee keep that information within the Committee? I don't -- I'm saying that because I think it is a legitimate -- it influences your decision in trying to balance the importance of it.

I think that I -- I'd like to think that I would have prevailed on the President long ago --

THE CHAIRMAN: The Director did not -- the

President did not notify Congress. It's not

hypothetical -- given the operation that was ongoing,

given the fact that we were trading arms to terrorists,

and you said that disturbed you greatly. It was at

variance with our public policy. Would you have

remained a part of the Administration? I believe as

strongly as you do about the responsibility of this

Committee and others to keep secrets as you know. We

have battened down the hatches. I don't think from the

current Membership of this Committee, those currently a

Member of this Committee since January of this year, I

don't think we have had any information inappropriately

released. We don't even let it out of our space.

Documents or notes.

What would you have done?

JUDGE WEBSTER: If I can take that one as a given, in that context, I would have insisted that there be notification or I would have not been able to stay.

Now, at the exact point at which I would do, I'm not -- today, I don't think I can pin that down, because I don't know enough. But I'm confident during -- that period was too long. And you should have been notified.

THE CHAIRMAN: At some time in that period after you had attempted to change the notification policy or the policy itself, you would have left. Is that correct?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me go back again to this logical question that Senator Cohen raised. He said, and I must confess the more I think about it the more difficulty I have in understanding it. We have an investigation of the Hasenfus matter. We have an investigation of Southern Air Transport in terms of their operations in Central America.

You have said that until November the 25th, that you were like the rest of us in this country, you didn't realize there was any connection, diversion of funds

from the Iranian arms sale to the Central American activity.

What was it? If you could recreate for us, first of all, who was it, how did this request first come to your attention and what did the person say to you that delivered the message — on October the 30th — that they wanted that investigation suspended or delayed for a period of time?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I received a telephone call from the Associate Attorney General. That's Stephen Trott. He's the number three man in the Justice Department, and he is the person in charge of all criminal activities in the Justice Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: And he called you himself?

JUDGE WEBSTER: He called me himself.

And I'm referring now to my memorandum as I talk to you because I used almost verbatim language.

He called me on the secure line. Said he was calling at the request of the Attorney General. And he said the Attorney General would like to suspend for ten days any nonurgent work on the Southern Air Transport Neutrality Act investigation. He said that there were apparently some sensitive hostage negotiations going on that could possibly be prejudiced.

He told me that he didn't -- that the Attorney

SSCI FORM 23

General did not want to do anything which would wreck the investigation, but simply wanted to permit a good climate for the negotiations to the extent possible.

And I said that I would check with our Criminal Investigative Division and if there were no problems we would go ahead and do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you ask him anything else at that point?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I did not ask him anything else. I'm not sure that he knew anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you yourself wonder? In other words, why is it that an investigation of something going in Central America is related to the release of hostages in --

JUDGE WEBSTER: He was referring to our activity at the Southern Air Transport Company in Florida. And I knew from the report from Mr. Revell that Colonel North had told him that that airline had been used to help the project in Iran.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand. But even if Southern Air was providing transportation, or had provided some transportation for arms to Iran, why would the investigation into Southern Air's involvement in Central America, what kind of information and to whom could that information — in other words, if information continued

to be put into an FBI file by investigators about, well, here's what Southern Air is doing in Central America, how could that jeopardize the hostages? Logically?

JUDGE WEBSTER: My testimony on that this morning was and is that this operation was so sensitive that they -- everything had been done to minimize any non-need-to know involvement. And it did everything possible to operate in a covert manner and not have people speculating when -- anytime -- I'm not trying to put thoughts into the minds of the Attorney General or even why -- I'm trying to explain why I didn't think it was unusual. Anytime there is an FBI investigation, people begin to focus on why is there an investigation. We are -- we're there with numbers of people, and I am sure that there was concern expressed somewhere to the Attorney General which he felt was valid, and he passed it through Mr. Trott to me.

I came at it looking at it from the standpoint of is this request going to damage an ongoing investigation? Not whether the Attorney General's judgment on this ought to be questioned. But whether or not the investigation he wanted us to suspend would be hurt by such suspension. And so I passed that question to our career people who said that it would not.

And since the Attorney General had asked for it,

had given a reason that I thought was reasonable, I didn't second guess that and I don't now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it simply because the same firm, Southern Air, was involved in Iranian arms transportation and was under investigation in Central America, is that the only logical -- I'm sort of puzzled by why you didn't say to Mr. Trott, well what does that have to do with the hostages? Or how on earth is there any logical connection between suspending an investigation of something going on in Central America with whatever involvement these people may have had elsewhere?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe Mr. Trott knew about the hostage negotiations. Only Mr. Revell and I in the Bureau, only the Attorney General in the Department, were aware of what the National Security Council was doing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you didn't ask him to call back and say I'd like to talk to the Attorney General or know why he --

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, because I talked to Mr. Clarke, and he said it wouldn't affect our investigation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't affect the investigation?
What about at the end of the ten day period? What action did you take then in terms of reopening the

investigation at the end of the ten day period?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I called back to Mr. Trott and

said, "The ten days are up. Can we begin?" And he said, "I don't know. I'll get back to you." He got back to us on the 20th.

THE CHAIRMAN: And said it was all right to resume the negotiations?

JUDGE WEBSTER: That's right. No restrictions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to go into the matter of the Varelli situation, but I think our time is such that I better not commence that.

Now, let me go on to Senator Cohen at this time.

SENATOR COHEN: Well, I think I should take umbrage at one of the Chairman's last remarks. He said that I asked a question, the logic of which could not escape him. Part of that was that I asked questions of which the logic does escape him --

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me correct the record. On this instance, I understood the logic of the question but not the logical connection between the two points being raised.

SENATOR COHEN: We are trying to define exactly what you see as the parameters for the timely notification to the Congress. I think you made a statement in response to Senator Boren that if the

reasons that the President originally offered for not notifying Congress were no longer as important as they were at the time, then you would give consideration at that point to insisting that notice be given.

I have a difficulty with that because it is still very broad. For example, there are two reasons that were offered for not notifying Congress: number one, this was a new strategic opening to Iran. That strategic opening might take two years. In which case Congress would never be notified during that two year timeframe.

Secondly, there was what involved the primary motivation, and that was the return of the hostages. Every time a hostage was about to be returned, that would be justification enough not to notify Congress. So you have a program, theoretically, that could be carried on even under your interpretation of timely notice for as long as two years — or eighteen months as it was in this case. And you really suggest to this Committee that that is your understanding of what timely notice would constitute in the meaning of the law?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I think that this is one reason why that this particular hypothetical, even though we may know more about it than we do in other hypotheticals, is not as simple as it sounds because

perhaps more justification could be made for a diplomatic initiative over a sustained period of time than for a hostage situation involving the exchange of arms. And I don't really know that I know the answer to that, but what I tried to say in terms of defining my sense of timeliness — because the statute doesn't do it and I don't think can do it really — is not just when the reason was not as strong as it was in the beginning, but when the corresponding need to keep the Congress informed — to have the support of the Congress through the Intelligence Committees was more compelling than the remaining reasons for keeping it secret.

SENATOR COHEN: Do you recall seeing Mr. Gates testify before this Committee several weeks ago? Did you have a chance to either watch or read about his interpretation of timeliness?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I've only seen portions of Mr. Gates' testimony, and I have read portions of it.

SENATOR COHEN: With respect to timeliness, I think he indicated that forty-eight hours was about as timely as one could get within the meaning of that interpretation. That beyond that time, he would start to be very concerned, and would feel compelled to notify Congress.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I haven't any problem with that. I

SSCI FORM 23

A

think he said several days would be his view of the outside.

SENATOR COHEN: So you would confine timely notice, then, to within several days, as opposed to several months or in some cases several years?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I would try to relate it to the particular situation. And as I said in my testimony, I have trouble imagining any situation that is so sensitive and life threatening that the Congress cannot be advised of it.

But one thing, not only do I believe the act makes it clear that you're entitled to be informed, but also, I think, that any project that cannot survive Congressional notification is suspect from the beginning.

SENATOR COHEN: You also indicated that one other test that you would apply would be that you would have to know wheter Congress could keep that secret. That is not a condition in the statute.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I realize that. And I appreciate your bringing that to my attention. But there are no conditions in the statute. It says that the President should give his reasons why and that he should notify in a timely way. And I was trying to leave room for things that I have said I cannot even imagine that would --

where something was so tight that they couldn't come. I can't -- I really -- I'm a lot in the situation I was when I stood before the Committee -- Judiciary Committee to be Director of the FBI. I'm trying to leave myself room for the unknown. But I'm telling you that I don't know any situations where you shouldn't be promptly advised.

SENATOR COHEN: I share your concern about not wanting to disclose information that might possibly be leaked and jeopardize lives, and Senator Boren and the rest of us who sit on this Committee are certainly dedicated to that.

But that qualification is not part of the law, and it's one of the things that ended in this entire Iran affair where you have Ollie North, for example, saying let's not tell Secretary Shultz. If you tell the Secretary of State, that's the end of the program. And let's not tell all of the other people, and soon you have a private foreign policy being carried out without anyone's notice or knowledge beyond a select group within the White House. And that's a very dangerous situation to --

JUDGE WEBSTER: I agree with that. And it's one of the reasons of leaking at the Executive branch and leaking elsewhere. It's such a concern to people. If

SSCI FORM 23

5

there was some history of rapid leaking, you can appreciate how it could be for them.

SENATOR COHEN: I would suggest that if you have concerns about the potential for leaks coming out of this Committee or the House Committee, you ought to come to the Committee and express those concerns.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I will. If I'm confirmed.

SENATOR COHEN: You also quoted William Stephenson this morning and it was an excellent quote.

Stephenson also wrote that the enemy is not only at our door, but inside our house — and in practically every room. I think Secretary Shultz has asked for the creation of a Committee or Commission to investigate the matter in Moscow. If it is determined that our Embassy in Moscow is not fit for human habitation, and Mr. Orkin can't fix it, would you recommend that the Soviets not be allowed to occupy the residence that is attached to the new Embassy on Mount Alto as well?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would.

SENATOR COHEN: Is it your concern perhaps that they could use the residency with equal or comparable ability to detect microwave signals coming out of --

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, I just believe that we have to insist on a reciprocity and equivalency at every level --

SENATOR COHEN: Are they occupying the residency now?

JUDGE WEBSTER: There is some -- I'm informed that they are in the apartments but there are no offices.

SENATOR COHEN: Your recommendation would be, if we do not move into the new Embassy, that they not be allowed to occupy the apartment side as well?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think I'm getting out in front of my self and my obligation to express that kind of view first through the National Security Council. But I think I have already indicated my perception.

SENATOR COHEN: Were you involved or at least aware of any sting operation pertaining to weapons sales to Iran in a case that emanated from New York?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Was I aware of --

SENATOR COHEN: Was the FBI the one who was running a sting operation in New York? Was that the Department of Justice?

JUDGE WEBSTER: In New York?

There have been a series of investigations to try to find arm peddlers. I'm not sure whether you are talking about that or the hostage situation. Which one are you referring to?

SENATOR COHEN: The arms sales.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I'm informed that that particular

.

case is a Customs case and not ours.

SENATOR COHEN: Excuse me. As to covert operations, would you support a sunset provision so that all covert operations automatically terminate after a specific period of time and would have to be reauthorized and reviewed by you and others before they could be continued?

In other words, you're stepping into a job in which there are many covert operations that have been underway for some time that you might not be fully familiar with, and you will be stepping onto a moving treadmill rather quickly.

Would you support a provision that would terminate all covert operations periodically unless they are reauthorized?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I'm not sure whether you are proposing that each one be terminated after a particular time or they all come up for a single sunset date.

SENATOR COHEN: Well, that they each have some specified period of time over which they run. The time frame at which would differ depending on when they were initiated but, in other --

JUDGE WEBSTER: But that would require some recertification?

SENATOR COHEN: A formal review by you and others

2.

and by the Committee, as a matter of fact --

JUDGE WEBSTER: I would be very much surprised if there isn't some internal procedure of that kind already. There certainly should be.

SENATOR COHEN: No there is not. As a matter of fact, Mr. Carlucci has only recently recommended that that take place in order to avoid the kind of situation where you may have an errant program under way of which you are not fully apprised.

JUDGE WEBSTER: All of our undercover operations in the FBI are subject to that kind of restraint -- of a review.

SENATOR COHEN: Are you aware of any intelligence activity that might be unlawful or contrary to an Executive Order which has not been reported to the Intelligence Oversight Board or to the Attorney General?

SENATOR COHEN: Well, I have some other questions dealing not only with the Varelli case, but also with the Catholic Bishop. I think we are going over our time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Specter?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, Senator.

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's late in the day and I have some questions on other topics too, Judge Webster, but let me turn to one

which you and I have discussed and I think have a general area of agreement on. And that relates to the FBI activities on ABSCAM which I think are important in terms of setting a tone of fairness. Certainly the Director of the FBI has a critical position in that respect. And perhaps the Director of CIA is even in a more critical position because even more secret items are done with the CIA and necessarily with covert activities.

You were nice enough to come and visit me before these confirmation hearings began. And I had raised with you a concern which I had about the necessity for some reason to target an individual. You had referred to it as a predicate. You might call it some basis for some proceeding. And it might be said that if someone is a public official, there is no justification of taking a bribe under any circumstance and a strong case can be made for that.

The rules which have been defined traditionally require probable cause when there is a search and seizure. Requires somewhat less when there is a stop and frisk and those are variations talking about drug testing and so forth now.

But in the course of the ABSCAM investigation, there were at least some instances where individuals

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were targeted for investigation. And they had some notoriety because they were Members of Congress. One a United States Senator, at least one Member of the House of Representatives.

And I believe personally that the power to investigate is a very great power. When I was District Attorney of Philadelphia, I recollected it very well the greater power, the prosecutorial powers or others because you could investigate again secretly, and I believe that there really has to be some predicate, some reason to proceed.

And I would like your observations at the outset as to your views as to what there ought to be before someone is made subject for target for an investigation.

MR. WEBSTER. Senator Specter, I appreciate that you noted that I use the word predication because I'm trying to get law enforcement community to stop using the word targeting when they're talking about people. It's all right to target a program and find out what's wrong whether it's labor racketeering or organized But when you begin to use the word targeting, it gives the impression that you've decided ahead of time that you are going to develop a criminal case against someone.

The predicate is really a better word conceptually

because it means that we have some reason for opening an investigation. That reasoning is not as strong as a full probable cause requirement where we already have the evidence, but it is at least some evidence that gives us reason to believe that a person has been or will engaged in crime.

I believe that that type of predicate, although it is not in my opinion required in law, is the responsible way for an investigative agency to proceed. We looked at the observations of the Senate Select Committee which reviewed the ABSCAM and other undercover operations at great length, and we took those recommendations very seriously.

At the time that we were in the midst of the Graylord investigation, in Chicago, I think in my opinion an even more important investigation and certainly a sensitive a one because we were inside the Cook County Judiciary investigating the judges in an undercover capacity. And when the Senate came down with this report, I asked that that report be laid alongside our investigations in Chicago to see whether there was a sufficient predicate as outlined in the Senate Select Committee report for those ongoing investigations.

And then we took the additional step of having all the files brought back to Washington because the Senate

Select Committee had recommended that these investigations be reviewed at a higher level and they were again reviewed for predication and returned.

And we have had dozens of convictions in Chicago in that investigation. I believe only one judge has been acquitted. It has rendered significant service to the country and to that community. And I have not seen one word in print criticizing the techniques used in the Graylord investigation.

So, that's the difference between getting the ABSCAM case off the ground in a very early seminal long-term investigation and learning lessons and acting on them for future investigations.

SENATOR SPECTER: Judge Webster, I'm not sure that you are correct when you say that a predicate is not required in the law. In preparation for this hearing, I had some research done and we found no case where a conviction was upheld or there was not some reason for the investigation to be initiated. That is not to say there is a square holding where the absence of a predicate or some reason to proceed led to a reversal. But it seems to me that as of this moment it may be more of an open question and one which candidly might be influenced by a statement by the Director of the FBI, a former federal judge, at a Senate hearing.

.

SSCI FORM 23

The Senate Select Committee was top on the FBI in one particular I would like to read it and see if you agree with it or disagree with it in terms of the use of some of the middlemen. You and I had not talked about this. I have seen this since the meeting but I would like -- your response to it. This appears in the Senate Select Committee report on Page 19, quote, "In some cases, the FBI relied on the representations of a middleman, no record of reliability for producing corrupt public officials. In some cases the FBI continued to rely on middlemen, even after they had proved to be unreliable in this regard. As a result, the FBI's unduly unquestioning reliance on middlemen at least one, apparently more, clearly innocent public official was brought before the hidden cameras", end quote.

Is that a fair statement, in your judgment?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I think it's a fair -- I think it's a fair criticism. I think there was not a total absence of predication. There was information. Where we are today and our use of this important and sensitive technique, we would not be as willing to rely on the kind of middlemen representations as we did in ABSCAM.

That middleman term needs to be expanded. These were individuals themselves under investigation who were

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

charged and went to prison. These were not cooperating witnesses.

SENATOR SPECTER: Well, some of them like Silvestri were not charged, were they?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Yes, Joseph Silvestri was charged, was convicted, was fined fifteen thousand dollars, and went to jail for three years on a sentence for three years.

SENATOR SPECTER: And he was all that there was to act against the United States Senator and a Congressman?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Well, he introduced -- he brought Congressman Thompson into the picture. Congressman Thompson was convicted and went to prison. He did also bring a United States Senator to the undercover scene. And that statement is correct.

SENATOR SPECTER: But the Senator walked out?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The Senator walked out.

SENATOR SPECTER: Without taking a bribe? Or suggesting any willingness to take the bribe?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Nor was he offered a bribe.

SENATOR SPECTER: But he was moved in that direction before he walked out?

He was moved in that direction by the questioning and comments in the townhouse in Georgetown before he walked out?

Was he not?

JUDGE WEBSTER: The Senator left the meeting without having indicated that he was interested in violating any criminal laws.

SENATOR SPECTER: Did you disagree with the Select Committee's characterization of Silvestri when they said on Page 72 of the report that, quote, "Joseph Silvestri was the most unreliable of the ABSCAM middlemen", unquote.

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I don't think I disagree with that.

SENATOR SPECTER: Now the time is running out,

Judge Webster, and I think it would be useful to see if

you agree with the specific standard. I think you have

already indicated that you have, but I think the future

proceedings, there would be some wait and some merit in

putting this on the record.

The Senate Select Committee articulated a number of standards which they thought should be accomplished through legislation. I believe that you said that you adopted a standard which relates to predicate or reasonable suspicion and I would ask if you agree with this standard which appears at Page 28. This is one of a number, but this is a relevant one here.

Quote, "No component of the Department of Justice

SSCI FORM 23

may initiate, maintain, expand, extend, or renew an undercover operation except, sub a, when the operation is intended to obtain information about an identified individual or to result in an offer to an identified individual of an opportunity to engage in a criminal act on a finding that there is a reasonable suspicious based on articulable facts that the individual has engaged, is engaging, or is likely to engage in criminal activity", close quote.

JUDGE WEBSTER: I have no problem with that. I think that that's substantially what is implied in -- what's stated in our FBI undercover guidelines.

SENATOR SPECTER: A final question.

SENATOR COHEN: Would you yield for a moment?

Was that guideline applied to the Senator who was invited to Georgetown?

As I recall, the FBI --

JUDGE WEBSTER: No, I don't -- I think probably not. I think probably not. I would not -- you will recall the circumstances, it was a short time frame judgment. I made the judgment. I take the responsibility. There were some in the Justice Department who were of the opinion not to let him come. Would have left open the fact that he was coming and we wouldn't let him come. And he would, in fact, would

have been out there unexplained.

I still think we could have found -- I still and now think that we could have found a better way to handle that situation without alerting the middleman to the fact that he was dealing with the FBI.

SENATOR SPECTER: So if you had that to do over, you would not have brought that Senator in?

JUDGE WEBSTER: No. I would have wanted -- he was a quick switch. I would have wanted to know more about it.

We had an hour to make up our minds. I had put protective provisions in place. One of them failed. One of them succeeded. The one that succeeded was that no money was to be offered until the Senator made a criminal representation.

SENATOR SPECTER: And, in fact, you wrote him a letter of exoneration?

JUDGE WEBSTER: I wrote him a letter that said that when I made a statement on the air about only looking for people who were willing to commit crimes that I was not talking about him.

SENATOR SPECTER: A final question I have for you, Judge Webster, is an inquiry which has been made by Congresswoman Schroeder who wrote to you on March 13, 1987, and I tried to reach Congresswoman Schroeder

SSCI FORM 23

earlier today and was unable to do so.

But have you had a chance to respond to her inquiry? She apparently was listed in an FBI book, or maybe I should ask the question, was Congresswoman Schroeder among others who were listed in an FBI publication denominated El Salvador's terrorism?

JUDGE WEBSTER: It is not a publication, Senator, it is -- it's what we call our FBI Terrorist Photo Album which includes photographs and biographical data.

She was not in our album. She has never been in our album. The form which was given to her, came in to her possession and which she showed to me is bogus. It's spurious, and I have written to her and told her both that it is spurious and that she is not nor has she ever been in our album.

SENATOR SPECTER: So you have had an opportunity and have responded to her letter of March 13, 1987?

JUDGE WEBSTER: She has some additional questions. I think, perhaps in another letter that we are trying to get the answers to. But I had a hand search made of our file so that I could give her unequivocal answer on that point.

SENATOR SPECTER: Thank you very much, Judge Webster.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

.

J

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just ask one brief comment on that.

Congresswoman Schroeder is not under investigation by the FBI?

JUDGE WEBSTER: Absolutely not. And as I explained to her in my letter, the photo album only contains people who are subject to full scale -- to full field investigation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, tomorrow we will have an opportunity to go into some of these other matters. I had hoped we might be able to finish today, but I am informed that there are enough questions that Members of the Committee want to continue to ask in open session.

This room is in use from noon until two o'clock tomorrow. Then it will take them sometime to put it back into order for us to resume our hearings tomorrow afternoon. So we will not be able to resume until approximately three o'clock tomorrow afternoon in this room.

At the end of that period, I will consult with the Members of the Committee to see if there are any other questions that need to be raised in executive session or in closed session. If so, we would take those up right at the end of that period.

I think it would be best to break at this point.

We have questioned you about every possible matter and it is certainly not our position to test your physical endurance in addition to the ordeal that we put you through today.

As I said at the outset, I know that you understand that all of these questions are offered in the spirit of meeting our own responsibility and not from the point of view of expressing any hostility toward you personally or toward your qualifications for office. We are in a situation in which the sensitivity of this particular position is one of great importance. I think you understand that from the circumstances in which you are nominated to the responsibilities of the DCI, this Committee feels a very high degree of responsibility to the Senate and to the country to explore every possible avenue and ask every question that needs to be asked. We appreciate your responsiveness to our questions today very much and I know that you will look forward to being with us again tomorrow.

We will resume at three o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The Committee will stand in recess until that time.

(Whereupon, at 4:31 o'clock p.m., the Committee was recessed to reconvene at 3:00 o'clock p.m., Wednesday,

April 9, 1987.)

SSCI FORM 23